The Journal

OF

PHILOLOGY.

EDITED BY

W. G. CLARK, M.A. *FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE,*

J. E. B. MAYOR, M.A. *FELLOW OF ST JOHN'S COLLEGE,*

AND

W. A. WRIGHT, M.A. *TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.*

VOL. III.

London and Cambridge:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO. CAMBRIDGE.
1871.

1248

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

CONTENTS.

No. V.

	PAGE
On an Accadian Seal. A. H. Sayce	1
On the End of the Epistle to the Romans. F. J. A. Hort	51
On the Enneakrunos at Athens. Thos. H. Dyer	81
On the Lengthening of Short Final Syllables in Vergil. H. Nettleship	95
On Æneas' Voyage Round Sicily. W. Everett	103
On the Chronology of St John v. and vi. J. P. Norris	107
Note on the 'Arzareth' of 4 Esdr. xiii. 45. W. A. Wright	113
On Lucretius, Book VI. H. A. J. Munro	115
A Theory of Job xix. 25—27. C. Taylor	128
On the History of the Ravenna Manuscript of Aristophanes. W. G. Clark	153
Notes on Thucydides and the Acharnians of Aristophanes. W. C. Green	161
Notes on the Supplices of Æschylus. A. H. Wratislaw	164
On the Athenian Proedri. E. L. Hicks	169
On the Sixth Satire of Persius. Thomas Maguire	183
On a Theban Inscription at the Fountain of Dirce. W. E. Currey	189

No. VI.

PAGE

The Epistle to the Romans. J. B. Lightfoot . . . 193

Thought, Word, and Deed. E. B. Cowell 215

The Eastern Origin of the Christian Pseudepigraphic Writings. E. H. Palmer 223

Prof. Munro's Notes on Juvenal I. 13, and on Aetna 590. Thomas Maguire 232

The Roman Capitol, as laid down in Mr Burn's "Rome and the Campagna." Thos. H. Dyer 236

Acts xxi. 37, 38. A. H. Wratislaw 254

On Lucretius, Book VI. R. Ellis 260

A Passage in Œdipus Rex. Thomas Maguire . . . 277

Two Passages in Vergil. Thomas Maguire 278

Westphal's Methodische Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache. Evelyn Abbott 282

Notes on the Translation of Genesis. Charles Taylor . . 291

Note on Gen. vi. 16. F. Field 327

An Introduction to Greek and Latin Etymology. By John Peile, M.A. J. B. Mayor 328

'Decadence.' J. B. Mayor 347

Horatiana. Horace, Carm. I. 20. H. A. J. Munro . . 349

Carm. 2. 13, 14. *Pœnus perhorrescit.* J. E. Yonge . . 353

On Two Triple Readings in the New Testament. A. A. Vansittart 357

THE JOURNAL

OF

PHILOLOGY.

ON AN ACCADIAN SEAL.

THE cuneiform records have disclosed to us a new language. The earliest monuments found in Chaldæa, consisting of a few bricks and seals, are written in a language that is neither Semitic nor Aryan. The ideographic origin of the characters themselves points in the same direction. Finally, the oldest names of the cities, not only in Babylonia, but even in Assyria, appear to belong to the Allophylian family of speech. These proto-Chaldæan remains have, for want of a better name, been called Accadian. The early kings of that region entitled themselves rulers of "Sumiri and Accad", or, still oftener, of "the land of Accad" only. Accad is explained as "high", and would seem to refer to the mountainous country to the east of the Euphrates. Sumiri (also called *Cassi*) is apparently "the plains"; and Dr Haigh has suggested with great probability that it is the original of שִׁנְעָר. *Dingir*, the ancient form of the Accadian word for "god", became afterwards *Dimir;* and *Gingir*, the Accadian Astarte, is perhaps identical with *Gimir* "a foreigner". The cuneiform system of writing was an Accadian invention, each sign being a hieroglyphic representation of the object for which it stood, gradually corrupted, as is the case with Chinese, into the forms which we meet with on existing monuments. Hence, without some knowledge of the language of the inventors, a full acquaintance with Assyrian, which en-

deavoured to express a Semitic grammar and vocabulary in a foreign syllabary, is out of the question. Considering the paucity and scantiness of any Accadian inscriptions, such a knowledge might have seemed impossible. Fortunately however the bilingual tablets of Assyrian and Accadian, drawn up by the order of Assur-bani-pal, the son of Essarhaddon, have been preserved in a more or less mutilated condition. Had they come down to us perfect, we should have had, without doubt, a complete grammar of the ancient tongue of Chaldæa. As it is, however, the fragments frequently are broken off just where their preservation would have been of most importance. It is necessary to proceed in great measure by the help of induction and comparison. Hence I have been compelled to relinquish the design I had originally formed of drawing up a complete Accadian grammar. The gaps and imperfections would have been so numerous that I have judged it my best course to take a single inscription, and to make the philological analysis which I have attached to it the means of setting forth all the facts of Accadian grammar which I have been able to get together. I shall conclude by endeavouring to fix the position of the Accadian among the recognised families of speech, and so to justify such analogies from other languages as I have brought forward in the commentary. The inscription which I have selected is one which, so far as I know, has never yet been published. It differs, also, from the chief part of those with which we are acquainted, in its not being royal. With the exception of the tenth line the characters are very legible.

The inscription is as follows:—

(1) (an) mi'-'su-ta ud-du-[a]
(2) (? sar) id zi-da
(3) na-pal-la-ci-ge
(4) (nam) tsil-lil
(5) (an) il-zi us cal-ga
(6) (?'sar) (Huru)-ci-ma-ca-cu
(7) ci-lum-la gu-za-lal
(8) tur lik-ba-bi-ge
(9) mu-na-(? ban)-sab-ba
(10) (?'sar)-mu.....di ga ca ni

(11) ga-an-tsil-lil
(12) mu-bi

TRANSLATION:—

"To the god who issues forth in power (Nergal), king of the right hand in the city of Napalla, for the life of Ilzi the strong male, king of all the land of the city of (Huru), I, Cilumla, the throne-supporter, the son of Lig-babi, perform-sacrifice. To my king, to the end of his days(?) may his name give life."

PHILOLOGICAL COMMENTARY:—

(1) The first character has the usual phonetic value of *an*. The full form is *annap*, which in the Elamite inscriptions signifies "god". The word would connect itself with Zyrianian *yen*, Zakute *yenem* ("god") and Wotiak *in* ("heaven"), *inmar* ("god", lit. "he who (is of) heaven"). The final *-p* is apparently a formative, which shows itself in *khili-p*, another Accadian word for the deity. The temple of Anu or Anna (= "the god") at Huruk is called indifferently Bit-Anna, and Bit-khili-Anna, where the final *-p* is dropped. Comp. the emphatic affix *-pä* of the Finnish (Wot. *-pa*, Esth. *-p*, Ost. *ap*[1]). The ordinary Accadian word for "god", however was *dingir*, which in later times became *dimir*. The root is a wide-spread one: Tartar *tengri* ("*god*"), Turk. *tangri* ("heaven"), Jakut. *tangara* ("heaven", "holy"), Fin. *taimas*, perhaps even Samoiedian *adjaan*. It has been borrowed by the Chinese under the form *tien*. It is to be noticed that the same law of corruption seems to have been at work in the Accadian and the Finnish. Before the plural affix *-ene*, *Dimir* becomes *dimirri*. Sometimes the *i-e* is contracted; *kharra* ("prince") becomes *karrine* ("princes"). (α) The oldest mode of forming the plural seems to have been by the repetition of the word (see § 7): thus *khar-khar* is interchangeable with *kharrine*, and *dimir-gal-gal-ene* is the customary way of expressing "the great gods." The last example shows clearly the primitive nature of the Accadian. Each agglutinative affix preserved its full force as an independent word. How far the corrupting influences which have made the Ugrian dialects tend towards the phenomena of an inflec-

[1] Cf. Castrén, *Ostjakische Sprachlehre*, p. 25.

tional language prevailed, will be stated in the course of the paper. The repetition of the root to signify the plural is common to all barbarous tongues. Traces are even to be found in such Greek words as δαιδάλλω, or such Latin words as *gurgulio*. The system of "pair-words" is characteristic of the Ugrian idioms. Thus "from year to year" would be *eszendöröl eszendöre* in Hung., *jepest japai* in Lapp. In Canarese collective nouns are formed in this way. In Malay again the use of *pair words* is very extensive. Often the root is merely repeated, as in the Accadian plurals of which we are speaking: *e.g. api-api* = "a scout", *bâsar-bâsar* = "very great". So in Basque we find traces of a plural in the verbs and in the postpositions. In the verbs and most of the postpositions the plural is *it* or *eta*, with which compare the Finnic plural below: in the postposition *-z*, however, the plural is formed by reduplication, *zaz*. It is noticeable that the plurals are prefixed, like the Accadian *ene* in *ene-mun*. (β) A second and most common method of forming the Accadian plural was by means of the suffix *ene*. I cannot discover that this word had a separate meaning of its own. In a contracted form *-ne* it was used to mark the plural of the present tense. I would explain its origin in the following manner. *In*, or rather *inni*, the 3rd pers. pron., became *ni* or *ne* before a vowel. To form the plural it was reduplicated—*nene*, "they". This was divided, as was the case with the future of Semitic verbs, and the aorist of Aryan verbs, to make the 3rd pers. pl. of the present tense. Hence *ene* or *ne* came to be regarded as a plural formative. In one instance it seems changed to *nu* according to the law of harmony; *ci-nu-cu* is given as signifying "to the places"; and once I have found it prefixed to the noun; "bricks" being rendered by *ene-mun*. The Wotiak *uno* ("many") can hardly be connected. We may compare the formation of the Basque plural by suffixing the demonstrative (*i.e.* the 3rd pers.) pron. (γ) Another way of forming the plural is by adding *mes*, "many", to the singular. The same affix makes the plural in Elamite (Third Achæmenian). Comp. Jakute *myz* "collect together"; Wot. *myzon* "another's", *myd* "in several ways". It is possible that the Ugrian plurals *yas* (Zyr.), *-yos* (Wotiak), *-t* (Fin., Lapp., Tcherem.,

Mordv., Hung.), *-k* (Lapp., Mordv., Hung., Ostiak), and *-n* or *-la* (Ost.) have the same origin. According to Prof. Max Müller "the old Ugric termination of the plural is *-äs*[1]." Analogous is the Turkish *-s* or *-k*, Mandschu *se*, Buriatian *-da* (?). Initial *m* or *b* (first changed to *w*) is constantly dropped. In Hungarian, *mek* forms the plural of nouns of relationship. I am not sure whether or not the Accadian possessed a dual. In the Assyrian inscriptions words expressing dual ideas, such as "hands" or "feet", had the numeral 2 affixed. If this were of Accadian origin, it would have been pronounced *kats*. This might possibly be compared with the dual termination possessed by the Ostiak, Lapponian, and Samoiedian, *kan* in the former, *ga* in the latter. Castrén, however, derives these from the enclitic *ki* "also", which bears a strong resemblance to the Accadian *ci* "with", and hence "also", and to a form *uru-ci*, which must mean "cities" in a phrase quoted below (§ 4), and *may* be a dual referring to Huru and Lar'sa, the only cities mentioned in the inscription. In the Taic Kassia the plural is expressed by the preposition *hi*. The word for "god" was also often used with the signification of "prince", and in this sense placed before royal names. So in Basque, *jauna* = "lord", and *jainco* = "God".

(2) *Mï's-'su* may be regarded either as a single or as a compound word. It is used by Assur-izir-pal (*B. M. S.* Vol. I. pl. 28), who speaks of "the gods Ussur and Nergal", (*Si-dun* "he who marches before") "who have exalted" (or "chosen" according to Dr Hincks) "power". The first character, with the value *miz* means "strong"; if sounded *sit* it = "to measure", if *cisip* it = "a foot". The second character usually signifies "to magnify". The number of compound words in Accadian is considerable, as is the case with Zyrianian, according to Castrén. The predicate generally follows the subject, not only in the case of pronouns (as in the Ugric and Tartaric languages, which herein differ from the Bhotiya, Lohitic, Tamulic, Chinese, &c.), but also in the case of adjectives which are conceived as de-

[1] "Last Results of the Turanian Researches" in Bunsen's *Phil. of Univ. Hist.* Vol. I. p. 460.

pendent genitives. This rule of position is found always in Basque and occasionally in a few dialects of the Ugrian, Caucasian, and Taic families, though the general order of the sentence in these languages is the reverse. It is, however, only the natural order to be followed by such idioms as affix the pronouns and use postpositions. And Accadian adopts the universal principle of the Allophylian dialects of placing the object (and generally the subject also) before the verb. A familiar example of what I have said above is to be met with in *ci-a* "a ford," literally "a place of water". Without doubt many of the words which at first sight appear to be compounded really are not so; the combination has merely taken place in the group of ideographic characters which were used to express the vocable. Thus *arali* "death" was expressed by ideographs which respectively denoted the ideas of "house," "land" and "corpse". Still the order of the signs would follow the customary order of thought. In thus placing adjectives and genitives after the subject the Accadian is imitated by the Basque. Here *egun*$^{(1)}$ *on*$^{(2)}$ would be "good$^{(2)}$ day$^{(1)}$", *echeá*$^{(1)}$ *gizon*$^{(2)}$ *onen*$^{(3)}$ would be "house$^{(1)}$ of this$^{(3)}$ man$^{(2)}$". I find some instances, however, in Accadian in which the converse arrangement of the sentence, found among the Altaic dialects, occurs. Thus *kha-luba* or *kha-dibba* is "fish-pond", *kha* being "fish". So again the words for "country" are regularly affixed to the proper name, as will be seen in § 8. But in this case it is possible that the proper name was not regarded as a dependent genitive, the defining words being rather co-ordinate. And when united with the suffix *ta* so as to form a compound postposition, *ci* by tmesis precedes the personal pronouns (see § 3 (1)). On the other hand, the Accadian, like all the so-called Turanian languages, makes large use of postpositions. It is not until we reach the boundary of the Taic family that we meet with prepositions. In another characteristic point, also, the Accadian has the same usage as the Altaic and Tamulic languages, though herein it differs from the Basque. The relative clause, or rather the governing verb-participle, is always post-fixed to the noun. Thus Rim-('*Sin*) says "dimir-gal-gal-ene (Huruk)-ci-ma - - - kat-mu-cu banin-

'ses-a", "the great gods who have filled Erech into my hand", and a common formulary with which Burna-buriyas and his son Curigal'su end their accounts of temple-building is "which to its place was given back". It will be noticed that in this last instance the Accadian departs from the usage of the Altaic languages, in which the relative clause precedes the word or words on which it depends. The Accadian arrangement is, however, more in keeping with the general order of words. A great proportion of the compounds are formed by thus post-fixing the participle: *e.g. na-zika* (literally "mark-making") is "memorial", *gis-pa* for "*gis-pa-a* (literally "speaking-wood") is "sceptre", *ir-gar* (lit. "judgement-making") is "ruler", *ca-zik* (lit. "speech-making") is "seal". In short, the determined element in a compound word, if viewed either as a participle or as a genitive, is regularly post-fixed. In the case of the participle, the Accadian, though agreeing, as I have said, with the Altaic languages, differs from the Basque, which prefixes the participle, *e.g. il-argia* "the moon" (lit. "destroying-light"). However, as we have seen, Accadian usage is already beginning to waver. On these grounds, therefore, *miz-zu* may be considered as a compound, *zu* being the participle, for *zu-a*. The final vowel, however, may belong to the simple word. Accadian roots are often lengthened in this way. Thus *gurus* = "a valiant one", *guruse* = "valour"; *uddun* "go forth", *uddune* "the not-going forth". So we find *gic* "setting", but *cuga* or *gissu* "sunset"; *babbar* "rising", but *babbara* "sunrise", "silver". In many cases, however, the abstract noun is marked by the feminine prefix *it*[1]: *e.g. cus* "resting", *it-cusu* "rest"; *dur* "fortress", *id-dur* "dwelling"; *mar* "abode", *it-mar* "brick-house". This *it* seems originally to have been the ideograph of a "comb", and so to have stood for "woman"; it also signified "prince" and "hand". A feminine noun was also expressed by the prefix *ca:* as in the word "loving", which is written *man, god, making* for the masculine, and this *ca* followed by the monograms of *god* and *making* for the feminine. For the primitive signification of *ca* see § 13. In Basque, as in the Taic and Lohitic

[1] *It*, however, may here mean simply "one"; see § 6.

dialects, gender is marked by *suffixes* which denote respectively *male* (*arra*, cp. Accadian *kharra*) and *female* (*emea*, cp. Accadian *um*). The same want of the distinction of gender characterises the Ugric and Tartaric languages. *Cu* is another preformative of the same kind. Thus *dara* and *cu-dara* signify "name"; *saq* is "head"; *cu-saq* "supremacy".

(3) *Ta* is a common postposition. It is generally used in the sense of "from"; *e.g. ê-ta ib-tan-uddu* "he drove from the house". Its original meaning, however, was "in". Thus Khammurabi says of himself: *banuv ê-par ê Parra Lar'sa-ma-ta*, "he raised Bit-Parra, the Temple of the Sun, at Senkereh". The postpositions mark out the Accadian as a member of the Turanian family of speech. In modern Allophylian dialects these postpositions are naturally the most conservative part of the language. They are often almost the only words which do not convey a distinct and independent meaning to the mind of the speaker. Hence in comparing the Accadian vocabulary with those of existing idioms, we ought first to take the postpositions. So far as I have been able to discover, the Accadian possessed the following:—

(1) *Cit* or *cita* "with". With the personal pronouns *cit* suffered tmesis; *e.g. ci-mu-ta* "with me", *ci-zu-ta* "with thee". Sometimes the final *ta* was dropped altogether, and then *ci* preceded the word it governed, as though it were a nominative: *ci Huru-ci-ma-ca* stands for "with all the land of the city Huru". Dr Hincks has well explained the origin of this word. It is a compound of *ci* (for *cingi* or *gin* "land") and the postposition *ta*, and would literally be "in the place of". With true Turanian instinct the Accadians never lost sight of the independent signification of *ci;* hence its employment in some cases before its case. *Cit* must be distinguished from *ge*, which is often expressed by the same character. Comp. Zakute *khonū* "field", "broad place", and *kiäng* "broad". So in Wotiak *intyin* (from *inty* "place") = "*pro*"; and the Basque *alde-an* "near" is from *alde* "place".

(2) *Cu* "for". *Cu* is very common: *e.g. garnam-bi in-nun-cu in-sem* "his soul for the child he gave"; *aria-da-cu ban-semmu* "into the river he throws her". Before the plural

affix, final *-u* is dropped, and an euphonic *a* inserted between the last consonant of a word and the *c-sound; e.g. innunac-ene* "for children" or "things". *Cu* often stands for the infinitive of the substantive verb (cp. Mong. *bü-kü* "to be"): "to (be) with him", for instance, is *ci-cical-bi-cu* or *ci-sium-bi-cu;* where the final *ta* of *cit* is dropped before another postposition, and the paraphrase for "self" is to be noticed. *Cical* is literally "strong place", *i. e.* "assistance" and *sium* (?) is "service". These paraphrases for the personal pronouns are common throughout all the Allophylian tongues, and give rise to an infinite number of pronominal forms. In Japanese there are no personal pronouns properly so-called; a number of words, originally meaning "body", and the like, are used for all the persons indiscriminately. The employment of *cu* to denote the infinitive perhaps explains the Turkic infinitive affix *mek,* for which the Mandschu has simply *me.* The future participle in Basque is formed by the suffix *co* or *go,* which is properly a postposition signifying "belonging to" (*e.g. Burgosecoa* "of Burgos", *nongo* "where?"). *Cu* originally meant "to be near", "to establish", in Accadian, hence "to serve", "be a slave", "to capture". *Ci-cu* "a seat" is literally "a place firmly-established": *cicu-garra* (lit. *seat-making* or *existing*) signifies "one who is close by". Postpositions of similar sound are widely found. The dative is expressed in Tamil by *ku,* in Telugu by *ki, ku,* or *ko;* and the Basque *ca* "to", "on", or *co, go* "in", are naturally referable to the same root.

(3) *Ga* "in", "having". This is a word of extensive use, as it is the only mark whereby adjectives can be distinguished from substantives. Thus *cal* is "strong" or "strength" or "to be strong", with *ga* added it becomes "powerful". *Enu ci-ga* is "lord of countries", *enu huru-ga* is "lord of cities". So *uz-ga* is "sea"; cp. Mag. *viz,* Fin. *vesi* "water". *Ga* primarily signified "to bind", and is used for the "yoke of a chariot". It seems to claim kindred with the Tartaric *ga* (Yakute *gha, ga, ka*), the dative-suffix. In Basque *gana* is "belonging to", "among", "with", *gatic* "for", "on account of".

(4) *Gab* (?) "over-against". I am not sure what was the phonetic value of this character when it was used as a post-

position. It was sounded also *khus*, and in Assyrian was *tsat*. In many cases the Assyrians adopted the words employed by their Turanian predecessors; and even, it would seem, several of their prepositions had an Accadian origin. If *tsat* were the pronunciation of the Accadian postposition, we might compare Basque *tzat* "for". *Ib* certainly was the usual word for "opponent" or "opposition", and *tic* was used in the same sense. *Mun-tic* or *mun-ib*, for instance, equally meant "front of brick". *Saggut*, again, had a similar signification, as well as *urugal* or *uragal*.

(5) *Ge*, "over", "taking". *Ge* like *gab* denotes "battle", "opposition". *Gi* also signifies "foundation", "strong", and with *n* added becomes the root which means "to dwell", "establish", as in *in-gin* "he placed", *in-gine* "he places". Lastly, the root = "to take", and this, I fancy, is the origin of the postposition rather than the other meanings. Many examples of its use are found, *e. g. enu cingi Accad-ge* "lord of the land of Accad", *saggadhu imtete-na-ge* "on the top of his person". In some cases I have found it replaced by *cu:* thus *Gungunuv* calls himself "king" *Huru-ma-ca-cu* "of all the land of Huru."

(6) *Gim* "like". With this word we may perhaps compare the Basque *cintzoa* "suitable", or the postposition *kin* "with". *An-gim* is frequently met with, explained to be "like the god Anu".

(7) *La* "among", "for". This postposition is of rare occurrence; indeed I am inclined to think that it is merely an euphonic alteration of *ta*. It is certainly interchanged with *ta* in the title of Nergal with which our inscription begins. We have it in *ucu-mal-ene* "among my men", though perhaps the middle character here is to be read *mur:* certainly in the 3rd s. present of the verb which signifies to "dwell" it is followed by the syllable *ra*. The postposition occurs again in an inscription of Burna-buriyas, who calls the Sun "the lord in the land of Sippara", *Larsa-ci-mati-la;* and in the legends of Amar-(? Sin) *li* follows the name of Mul, where other inscriptions would have *lal-ge*. So, also Nit-(Sin ?) says that he is "the powerful male, the shepherd...created by Mul", *Inucit-li garrà*. In Wotiak and Zyrianian *ly* forms the dative, *len* (Tcheremis.

lan) the genitive, *les* (Teherem. *letz*) the ablative. Jakute *ly, ny, dy* (Tartar *lai*, changed to *dai* after a consonant) builds the *adverbial case*, while *lyn* (or *dyn*, Turk. *ailah*) signifies "with".

(8) *Lal* "under". *Lal* is sufficiently common in Accadian inscriptions: *e. g.* Burna-buriyas calls the sun *enu gal ancia ci-lal* "great lord of heaven and earth". *Lal* is primarily "filling", hence "deep". Cognate words are the Ost. *tel*, (Magyar *tele* ("full"), Wot. *tyro* ("fill").

(9) *Libis* "the midst", *libis-ta* "in the midst". The compound *a-lib*, "water-surrounded", is the usual word for a "piece of ground", formed in accordance with the same conception that has made *a-caga* or *a-dega* (lit. "water-on-the-top-of") "the surface of the ground". *Immine Anna an-libista* translated "the flood of Anu in the midst of heaven"; and *libis-ga* is as common a compound as *libis-ta*. *Libis* seems originally to have signified "near"; cp. Wotiak *tupato* "to make suitable".

(10) *Na* "of", "on". This postposition is found in such expressions as *si-ni-na* "in his sight", *cicu-ani-nam* "on his seat", where the *na* is lengthened according to an euphonic law before a following *n*. The origin of *na* is to be sought in the demonstrative *na*, the formative element of the personal pronouns in Accadian as well as in the Ugrian and Tartaric languages, and which appears in the Jakute *innä* "there" or "thence", described by Böhtlingk as the locative of a lost pronominal stem *in*. The postposition *na* has many analogies. In Elamite (Third Achæmenian) the genitive is formed by the affix *na* (or *inna* after the plural ending *-ip*), the same element being repeated in the genitive of the 1st pers. pron. *hu-ni-na*. The genitive, again, is made by *en* in Mordvin. and Lapponic, by *-n* in Finnish, by *-in* in Turk., by *ni* in Mands. and by *yin* in Mongol., while in Jakute (which has no genitive) *na* or *yna* is the mark of the locative, *nan* of the instrumental (like Wot. *yn*, Zyr. *ön*), and *na, da* or *la* of the acc. indef. The acc. def. is made by affixing *i* or *y*, which is preceded by *n* after vowels. This *n* Böhtlingk traces to the pronominal *in*, just as in Basque the nasal of the *dative* (*oni*) and of one form of the nom. and

gen. (*onéc*, and *onen*) of the demonst. pron. is not an euphonic interpolation, but a veritable part of the old pronoun. In Tamulic adjectives are formed by the affixes *ana*, *na*, *ni*, *in;* and Tschuvashian gives us from *man* "I", *man-yng* "mine", and *man-yng-yng* "of me". Basque forms its genitive by suffixing *-en*, and *n* (pl. *etan*, compounded with *ga* in *gan* "in", and with *ki* in *kin* "with") is the locative postposition. After a vowel of the *i*-order *na* in the Accadian became *in:* hence the character which had this value is used to express the Assyrian preposition *adi* "to".

(11) *Ra* "to". We meet with many examples of this postposition in the inscriptions. After an *i*-vowel *ra* becomes *ir* (*e.g. Dumugu 'sar* (?)-*anir* "to the moon his king"). In the same way after an *u*-vowel, it becomes *ur;* thus Rim-Sin (?) has *Ninip 'sar* (?)-*mur* "to Ussur my king". Analogously, after an *a*-vowel the form of the postposition would be *ar*. This euphonic law seems to apply to all monosyllabic affixes which terminate in *ă* short: it is not applicable, however, to such as end in *ā* long, like *tā;* though even this, as we have seen, sometimes loses its final vowel when compounded with *ci*. One of the meanings of the root *ra* is "to inundate". This may be the origin of its use as a postposition. Compare the Basque *ra* (pl. *etara*) "to"; *ronz* (pl. *etaronz*) "towards".

(12) *Ruv* (?) "according to". I am not sure what was the proper pronunciation of this postposition. The character had the further values of *as* and *ina*, and *both* these values represented Assyrian prepositions. One or other of these latter, if not both, were in all probability derived from the Accadian. If the first, we may compare the Wot. *oz*, Zyr. *ödz*, the terminative affix (*e.g. ta dyröz* "up to this time"), or the Basq. *z* (pl. *zaz*), Mong. *etze* (?), which form the ablative. In Basque, also, the affix *iz* forms several of the adverbs of time. In the Accadian itself *assan* is "high". If *ina* be the word, we may compare the Basque adverbs which are built by the postposition *n*. Instances of the use of the postposition in question in Accadian are to be found in *gubtagubba-ruv* "for the being fortified", and in *pakh-ruv* (?), which is translated "much" or "strongly". I am inclined to think that the correct pronun-

ciation of the word is *as*, since this is the value which the character bears in all the Accadian inscriptions in which I have found it; *e.g.* in *inaddunas* "they have caused to go".

(13) *Ta*, *te*, "to", "at", "in", "from". I have already given examples of this word. It is also used to form the adverbial case; *ama-ta* is "like a whirlwind". A preceding dental is assimilated and dropped: thus *mad-ta* (for *mada-ta* "in the land") becomes simply *ma-ta*. I do not know whether *ta* or *te* was the original form of the word: in the old inscriptions it generally occurs under the form of *te*, a root which signified "a basement". We must compare the Basque *di*, *dic*, or *tic* (pl. *etatic*, or *etaric* with the euphonic *r*) which denotes "from". We have *ti* in Wot., *öd* in Zyr. for the penetrative case; in the Tartaric dialects *dan*, or *tan*, Osmanli *den*, after hard consonants, forms the ablative. The locative is expressed in Mands., Mong., and Turk. by *da*, *de*, and *du*.

(14) *Tiq* "across" "in front", "behind", "over", "on". These various meanings are all to be traced to the two primary significations of the root "to cross" and "a front". Thus *cia-tiq* = "across a place of water", *i. e.* "a ford", *ru-tiq* "front of a front", *mā-tiq* "top of a ship", *mun-tiq* "before brick", *cicu-tiq* "on a seat". Comp. Jakute *tyz* "what is before one", Turk. *tush* "opposite" (like *tash* "rock" compared with Accadian *taq*).

(15) *Tuq* "for", "to". This is the participle of *tuq* "to have", apparently identical with the Basque *duqui* "habere", whence comes the common verb *ukhen* or *ucan*, the initial dental being dropped, as in many other cases. An example of this postposition is *kharra-tuq*, which is rendered "to a man".

These postpositions may be compounded one with the other, and so produce a new set of postpositions. We have already mentioned *libis-ga* and *libis-ta*. One of the most common is *ge-lal* "up from under", as in *ar-gelal* "up from under the district" *i.e.* "a generation". We find also *lal-ge:* the Moon-god, for instance, is called *tu saq Mul-lalge* "eldest son of Mul." So, again, in the mythological tablets we have *Maruduq tur sak Inuci-ga-ge* "Merodach, eldest son of Hea", *tur-mes Inuci-ga-ge* "the children of Hea". This composition of postpositions is common both in the Ugric dialects and in Basque.

According to Prof. Max Müller it is also to be found in Canarese.

Before concluding this account of the Accadian postpositions I must not omit to mention an affix which, like *ruv*(?), is used for the adverbial case. This is *bi* or *khas*, I do not know which was the correct pronunciation, but I fancy the latter. Thus *makh-khas* is "much" or "supremely", *gal-khas* is "greatly", *susa-pallal-khas* is "by way of punishment" (= *takma* "a penalty"), *susapallal* being translated *zamaru*. Comp. the Tartaric *künüz* "daily" from *kün* "day", and such temporal adverbs in Basque as *noiz, maiz*[1]. One curious fact about these postpositions is that in the earliest inscriptions they are wanting almost entirely. The position of the words, as in Chinese, determines the grammatical relations. Indeed the age of an inscription can in great measure be settled by the absence or the frequency of these connecting suffixes: and their occurrence in the inscription which we are at present considering is the reason that induces me to regard the king addressed as not identical with the monarch of the same name whose brick-legends we possess (see § 10). Even when postpositions became plentiful, their primary meaning was as little obscured as it is in the Taic dialects, which have in like manner developed a set of prepositions. A postposition in Accadian was nothing more than a participle: if used as a substantive, it followed the rule of substantives and stood before its case. Several of these prepositions are to be found. They are not indeed prepositions properly so-called, but nouns followed by a genitive which answer to the prepositions of European languages. Thus *si* "the eye" or "sight" (like Assyrian *pan*, פנים) was used to express the idea of "before," *e.g. si-gut* "before an ox," *si-dun* "going before"; *mukh-bi* would be "over him," *mukh-si* or *bar-si* or *anna-si* is "above the eye", though *pi-anna* is "above the ear", where *anna* is used as a participle (*i.e.* a postposition). *Anna* may be the fuller form of the demonstrative, and hence identical with the postposition *na*, as may be seen by comparing the last example with

[1] If the character is to be read *khas*, it may determine the value of *ruv* to be *as*, the initial guttural being dropped, as is common.

taq-na "a high stone" (lit. "on the stone"), though I should prefer to identify it with *anna* "high", whence *annap* and the god Anna or *Na* (נח). How natural this primitive form of the sentence is may be seen from its being observed in Taic and Malay, which employ prepositions not postpositions (except in the Malay acc. which affixes the Sanskrit *pâda*) *e.g. di nâgri* "in the country"; while the genitive, without any mark of case being attached, stands after the governing word. The Accadian order of words is also observed in these languages by the place of the adjective, which follows the substantive, by the plural being formed by an affixed substantive, by the possessive pronominal suffixes being (in Malay) merely the personal pronouns *added* to the noun, and above all by the personal pronouns preceding the root in the conjugation of the verb, the different tenses being distinguished by affixes or infixes. The words, however, which denote a difference of gender are affixed not prefixed.

(4) *Uddu-a* or *udduna* is the participle of *uddu* or *uddun* "going out". If the root is derived from *dun* "to go" (like *sidun*), a nasal must be inserted: however as I do not know of any similar sense in which *ud* was used, and as we find *udda* "fire", I should prefer to read *uddu* and not *uddun*. *Uddu* before its case is a substantive, *i.e.* a preposition, *e.g. uddu guza Lar'sa-ci-ma* "on the throne of the land of Lar'sa". The use of the participle is very extensive in Accadian, as it is in all the Turanian languages. The Turkic present (in *-er*) is really a participle, and relative sentences in Basque are formed by the same means. The participial termination is one of the few portions of Accadian grammar which has disguised its derivation. Arguing from the analogy of other Turanian languages it ought to be the demonstrative pronoun. In this case the long *a* would be corrupted from an original *an*, like Basque verbal adjectives in *i, a, u,* primitively *na, nu, n, du.* In the latter language, again, *a* the 3rd pers. pron. seems to have been originally *an,* the source of the postfixed article *a* or *ac.* To this, again, we must refer the Basque participial ending in *-an, -en, -n.* In the Tartaric dialects the gerundive in *-a* seems to ally itself with the participles in *-at* and *-an* (cf. Mordvinian part-

endings *van, vat, vi*). In Jakute, according to Böhtlingk[1], many adverbs and postpositions are nothing more than this gerundive; *e.g. yla*, "of", from *yl* "to take away," *cytta* "like", "with", from *kytyn* "to join oneself." This is exactly analogous to what I have shewn in the last section to have been the case in Accadian. We find many instances of the use of the participle in the inscriptions to denote a relative clause. Thus *āda uru kaniq-tuq ni-bat-e uru-ci-mada-nu-cu immingarra-à* is "the river of the city for a canal he opens, which for the cities of his country was fully made"; and a common phrase is *ci-bi-cu nen-dib-a* "which to its place was brought back". Sometimes, however, for the sake of greater clearness and emphasis, the relative clause was expressed not by the participle alone, but by the participle and the character which stands for "man". This was pronounced *gum* (sometimes *gumma*), though *ucu* was the generic term. (*Uruci?*), for instance, calls himself "king of the land of Accad", *gum ê Mul-lal in-ziq-a* "he who has built the temple of Mul"; and another king has "*gum inbisi-cu ci-bi ne-dib-a* "he who has restored his country to *affluence*" (?). This use of the word "man" for the relative pron. is common in the Turanian dialects. In Basque the demonstrative is often added to the participial clause. With *gum* or *gu* (= *cu*, comp. *cuga* and *gic*) we may compare the Basque relative *cen-a* (*giz-on* "man"), Zyr. *kod*, Tcherem. *kudy, kü*, Wot. *kud, kin*, Mordv. *kon*, Ost. *khoi*, Fin. *ku*, Elamite *akka, appa*, Tartaric *kha, khai, khan, kim*, (*kizi* "man"). Cf. § 16.

(5) The first character of line 2 denotes "a king." Its value is doubtful, but it seems to have ended in *-m*. Owing to a fracture of the tablet, the first sign which represented its Accadian pronunciation in one of the bilingual syllabaries is lost, and only the last sign *-mi* is left. In another place I have found this character followed by *ma* and translated by the Assyrian *sarru* "king". Apparently, however, it was also pronounced *sar* even in Accadian times, since it is the first component of the name of *'Sargina*, an ancient mythological hero as well as an early king of Babylonia. *'Sar-gina* would be "rex

[1] *Ueber die Sprache der Jakuten*, p. 214.

primus," though when the name was adopted by the Assyrians they transformed *gina* into their own word *cinu* from בֵּן. *'Sar,* changed into *sarru,* was probably one of those many monosyllabic vocables which the Semites borrowed from their Accadian predecessors and 'Semitised' by investing them with a triliteral form. The bilingual tablets afford us numerous instances of this process; the loan-words appearing in many cases to have been early adopted and so to be common to most of the Semitic languages. In some instances these loan-words have been made stems for further derivations; thus the Accadian *kharra* "man", under the form *khirru* has been made to yield, in accordance with the genius of Semitic speech, *khiratu* or *khirtu* "woman". It is possible that most of the monosyllabic roots found in the Semitic languages came from a Turanian source. Like semi-civilised peoples generally, the Accadians had a great number of synonymes for "king".

(6) *It* "hand". This is another Accadian word which has passed into the Semitic tongues. Equally common in Accadian to express the same idea is *kat* (or as it seems primarily to have been sounded *kattakh*). Compounded with *ti* "to raise", this becomes *katti* "to seize", a verb in which, with true Turanian desire to keep each root clear and distinct, the objective case is separated from *ti* in the tenses, and the personal pronouns placed between them; *e.g. kat-nen-ti* "he took", *kat-bab-ti-e* "he takes." *Kat* and *it* or *yat* are seemingly identical, the initial guttural becoming lost, through an intervening form in *kh,* as in other Turanian dialects. Thus Tcheremiss *kol* ("die") is the Mag. *hal,* Ost. *had,* Basque *il;* Zyrn. *kul* ("hear"), Ost. *hud,* and (by an interchange of the guttural and labial) *pet* ("ear"), Zyr. *pely,* Mag. *ful,* Mord. *pile,* Basque *belarria,* Accad. *pi. It* connects itself with the Turk. *il,* Jakute *ilī* "hand." *It* also signified "one". This origin of the numeral "one" is curious. It takes us back to a time when the savage signified his first idea of number by holding up his hand. *It* or *kat* is clearly allied to *akat,* the base for "one" in the Ural-Altaic languages according to Professor Schott. Hence Lapp. *akt,* Fin. *yht* (which resembles the Accadian form very closely), Esth. *uts,* Basq. *bat,* Ost. *öt* or *it* (and *i*), Zyr. *ötik,* Mag. *egy,*

Mord. *vaïke*. The final guttural in the last three words may claim kindred with Accadian *gina* "primus", Mong. *nege, nikka* ("one"). The Accadian word for "two" has similar Ugric affinities. It is *kats*, Esth. *kats*, Fin. *kaks*, Zyr. *kyk*, Ost. *kat*, Magy. *kettö;* Yak. *ikki*, Turk. *(y)iki*, Mong. *kuyar*. The Basque has borrowed the Aryan numeral *bi*. Out of this Basque has formed *bide* "a road"; just as in Accadian *kats* or *kharan* was employed to represent the same idea. From *kharan* comes the name of the city which commanded the high-road to the West. We do not, unfortunately, possess the names of the other Accadian numerals. *Si*, however, seems to mean "five", and *esa* "fifteen". Comp. Fin. *viisi*, Esth. *wiis*, Tcherem. *vis*, Magy. *öt*, Samoiedian *sam-lik*, Tchuvashian *pilik*, Yak. *biäs*, Turk. *besh*, Basq. *bortzi* or *bost*, Mong. *tha-ba* and *ta-bun*, Tung. *sunja*. *Sanabi* perhaps is "forty", and *us* or *sus* "sixty". The latter would remind us of the Basq. *sei* ("six"). Ordinals were expressed by adding either *nalla* "being" or *gan* (also *ganva*) with the same meaning. With the latter, originally the demonstrative (which seems shortened to *na* in *gina*), comp. the Tartar ordinal formative *n* or *in*.

(7) *Zida* "right", opposed to *gupu* "left", connected with *im zidi* "the north wind." This word possesses the formative *da* which is used extensively in Accadian. Kudur-Mabug is called *es-da mada Martu* "citizen of the West", *es* being explained "house", one of the monosyllabic roots adopted by the Assyrians under the form *esu* "a building." The affix appears, again, in *ma-da* "country", more frequently written *ma* simply, a root found in most of the Turanian dialects (Zyr. and Wot. *mu*, or Esthon. *ma* for example). The Elamite has *murun*, and to this Tcheremiss adds *da* (*mulända*) as in Accadian. So again *khir* "to repel" becomes *khirda* "an enclosure". The suffix occurs in the brick-legends chiefly in the group of characters which represents the Semitic *kiprat arbat* "the four peoples". First comes the determinative prefix of divinity, as little sounded as in the Elamite (*an*) *ciq* "the sky" (literally "the divine blue"), or in the Accadian (*an*)*e* "heaven" (lit. "the divine hollow"). Then follows *ar* "a region", then the individualising complement *da*. This is succeeded by the

monogram of "four", with *ba* sometimes added. The latter addition has induced cunealogers to regard this group of characters as pronounced in a Semitic manner. In the bi-lingual tablets, however, the group is given as Accadian, without any suffix *ba*, and translated *tupukatu irbittu* or *ciprat irbittu*, the correct form, since *irba* would not be in accordance with the rules of Semitic grammar. If therefore, the Semitic origin of the title in question is still insisted upon, we must consider it as one borrowed by the Accadians from their Arab neighbours[1]. An early intercourse between the two races is evidenced by their common stock of traditions (of the Flood, the Garden of Eden, the Tower of Babel, etc.), which seem to have had an Accadian origin; not to speak of the Arab dynasty, which according to Berosus held sway in Chaldea[2]. The termination *ba* in the numeral "four" does not seem to connect itself with Turanian analogies, although we have in the Mongolic dialects *tirba, durban* and *dorban*. Another word which exemplifies the use of *da* is *a-da* or *aria-da* "a river" from *a* or *aria* (comp. Basq. *ura*) "water". The suffix has an individualising, demonstrative force; which reminds us of the Samoiedian affix *da* as *láta-da* "the board" from *láta* "board", which Castrén has shown to be the possessive 3rd personal suffix[3]. *Da* or *ta* and *so* (Tcherem. *ty* or *tyda* and *seda*) is the demonstrative pron. in the allied dialects, like *iti* in Jakute; which reappears in Ost. *teu* "he", and Sokpa *tha*. The Sokpa would have the same origin as the Buriat *ene*, which again refers us to the Tataric *ol*.

In Basque *d* and *te* represent the 3rd pers. pr. sing. and pl. in the verbal forms, and the article suffix is nothing more than the demonstrative, which has probably lost an initial dental, as is the case with *ukan* originally *dukan*, or with *aurra* "child", which seems to belong to the same root as the Accadian *tur*. Upon such grounds, therefore, I conclude that

[1] Naram-Sin, who bears a Semitic name, and who has *ciprativ arbraiv* (pl. masc.), belonged to the Assyrian dynasty.

[2] Many words were doubtlessly borrowed mutually. *Gabiri*, for instance, one of the many Accadian terms for "mountain" seems clearly جبل.

[3] *De Affixis Personalibus Linguarum Altaicarum* p. 11.

da in Accadian also was primitively a demonstrative, a bye-form of *na* set apart for a special purpose. We find *da* in one place translated "a male", and *da-ri* "a child", while *du-ri* is rendered "before a man". The frequently-occurring adjective, again, which means "long", is more often *buda* than *bu*. When *at* "a father" is to be specialised, *da* is affixed, the preceding dental being assimilated. Thus we have *tur ad-da-na-ra adda-mu nu-mia bannenduq*, "a son has said to his father, thou art not my father"; and Kudur-Mabug is called by his son *addae-mu*, "my father", where *ae* was probably pronounced as a diphthong. So again *len* (?) is "a memorial", *len-da* "the memorial"; and the collective *mulu-da* "subjects", is thus formed from *mul* ("lord"). The last example shows the way in which this termination came to represent the plural, as in (*an*) *Arda*. Comp. the Buriat. pl. *-da*. *Accada* itself is an instance of the affix, being derived from *aca* "exalted", which is also used in the sense of "weighing", *i.e.* "raising" the scales.

I will here give a list of the other formatives which are possessed by the Accadian :—

Ba: "side" or "part", *e.g. ca-ba* "side of the mouth", *dur-ba* "part of the fortress".

B: *e.g. gub* ("fortify"), *dub* ("tablet" compared with *du*), *ab* ("month", compared with *ai* "moon").

C: *e.g. gic* ("difficult").

Ci: *e.g. gusci* ("red" cp. Basq. *gor*).

E, I, A, U: *e.g. me* ("battle"), *sizse* ("sacrifice", cp. *Ziz* "excellent"), *ge* ("conflict"); *gemi* ("the sea"), *isi* and *is* ("hill"), *arali* ("death"); *mā* ("ship"), *ê-a* ("house", generally *ê* only), *imte-va* ("self" compared with *imtete* and *imtez*), *dara* ("name"), *tura* and *tur* ("little"); *abu* ("flood"), *enu* ("lord"), *uzu* ("body").

Kh: *e.g. dikh* ("stone" compared with *dub* and *du*).

La: *e.g. galla, gula* and *gal* ("great"), *din-la* and *din* ("a family"), *mal* ("abode", compared with *mar* "dwell", "reign").

Ma, m: *e.g.* (*nam*) *din-ma* ("a family"), *lamma* ("a colossus"), *seslam* ("a race"), *titnum-ci* ("back", *i.e.* "west country", but *titnu* "behind"), *sem* and *se* ("to give").

N, Na: *e.g. agan* ("supreme" compared with *agazi*), *gingina* ("earth" compared with *cingi*), *cingi* ("land" compared with *ci*), *cin* ("a work"): *un* ("man") added, as in *um-un* ("prince," "son"), *uk-un* ("offspring").

P: *e.g. annap* from *anna* "high", *khilip* and *khili* (see § 1), *issep* and *cip* ("leader", "prince"), the latter perhaps from *ci*.

R, ra: *e.g. mar* ("to inhabit", cp. *ma* "country"), *zicura* and *zigaru* ("below", "prince", compared with *zicum*), *parra* and *par* ("the sun", compared with *pa* "to shine"), *zanaru* and *zana* ("high"), *barra* ("high", compared with *bar* "top"). So *dingir* ("god"), Jakute tangara, if, under the form *dimir* compared with Jak. *tammakh*, or *tammalā* "a drop of water", and the Accadian *dim* "water", would show the final *-ir* to be merely formative[1]. The word would then be derived from the idea of *rain*, just as *Indra* is from *indu* "drop". So the air-god, *Mir* or *Mir-mir*, is drawn from *mir* "rain": *mir-mir* "brightness" is a fresh derivative from the name of the god.

S: *e.g. libis* and *lib* ("place"), *amas* ("nail"), *sis* ("brother", whence *Sisci*, a name of the moon-god), *zizse* ("sacrifice"): *us* ("male") added as in *ucus* ("man", "soldier"), *dhus* ("soldier"), *gurus* ("hero"), *cus* ("a brother").

T, ta: *e.g. dugud* ("heavy"), *hurud* ("iron", Wot. *kort*), *vara-ta* and *vara* ("ancient"); *te* ("raise") added as in *aganxteti* "the raiser".

Vowels are also prefixed: *e.g. num* ("high", Wogul *numan*) and *enum* or *enuv* (whence perhaps *enu* "lord"), *egir* ("after" compared with *gir* "beginning"), *ucu* and *guv* and *cus, ugu* or *ugun* (as in *uguna-mi-cu* "to future days", *ugunu-cu* "for a day") "a day", compared with Turk. *kun* ("day"), Jak. *kun* ("day", "sun"), Basq. *egun*; ? Ugrian *nuna* or *nunal*. Gutturals are inserted as in *dingir, gingir*: and I have found *cilam* and *cebalam* ("an opponent").

I have found instances in Accadian of all the principal consonantal changes common among the Turanian races. The dental and the labial are changed in (*an*) *gallam-la uddua*, a title of Negal, which is also written (*an*) *gallam-ta uddua*

[1] Cp. Turkic (Kazan) *dengiz, deniz*, "sea", Mong. *denggis*.

"he who goes forth in might." The labial and the nasal, again, are frequently interchanged: *e.g. algubba* for *an-gubba* "he fortifies." *R* and *l* take each other's place as in *mal* and *mar*. The initial guttural undergoes the usual alterations: *c* and *g* are constantly shifting, as in *cuga* and *gic*, *gub* or *guv* and *cu'u* ("precious"), *gum* and *ucu*. Still more common is the interchange of *c* and *k*, *e.g. ucu* and *uku* ("army"); and of all these with *kh* as in *ga-gar* "may he do", *kan-len* "may he proclaim", *kha-bara-uddu* "may he go forth", *ukhba* "clothing", *cuba* "clothed". Through the help of this strong aspirate the guttural is lost altogether; *e.g. kha-baran-duzzu* "may he not take", *a-banin-duz* "may it take him". Hence perhaps *kan* "to be", and *al* (Turk. *ol*), have the same root. The guttural and the labial also are interchanged, *e.g. dikh* and *dip* or *dup* "a stone". Perhaps, too, *dhus* and *cus* imply an interchange of the dental and guttural. *M* and *b* pass into one another (*ba* being sometimes written for *ma* "country", and *man-sem* standing for *ban-sem* "he gave him"), and are liable to be dropped altogether; thus *mus* is given in one place for *us*. *Z* and *g* further are confounded (see § 10). Final *n* before *m* probably becomes *m*: thus *ma* is sometimes added to *kan*, the mark of the ordinal numbers. *T* is assimilated to a following *d*.

The lengthening of words is a common feature of Accadian. I shall speak presently of the use of this means to form the present tense of verbs. The final consonant is doubled, and a vowel affixed of the same class as those of the root. Thus *bar* becomes *barra*, *miz* becomes *mizzu*, *kur* becomes *kurra*. As I said in § 2, this is a very frequent mode of forming the abstract substantive. It gives intensity to the idea by compelling the mind and the voice to dwell longer upon it. But a further and stronger way of producing the same result is to repeat the whole word, the final consonant with its vowel being attached to the second member. Thus *bar-barra* is "height." This is properly, as we have seen, an emphatic plural like *kur-kurru-tsu* "thy enemies". It is by a similar, though inverse practice, that the Tibetan and Lohitic idioms turn nouns into verbs; *e.g. nág* "black", *nággo* "it is black": and the same means are used in

Jakute and other Tataric languages to form diminutives (*e.g. küöl köluyā* "a little sea"), adverbs, and gerundial expressions (as *izen izen* "after long travels"). This alliteration has produced also many substantives and verbs in Mongolic and Ugric dialects.

(8). *Napalla-ci-ge* "In the city of Napalla". Napalla was a Chaldean town. *Ci* when added to the name of a place in writing was probably not sounded. The syllabaries translate it by "place", "land", and "fortress". The full form of the word was *cingi*, which is always written in *Cingi Accad* "the land of Accad", where the determinative preceded its genitive according to rule, and was phonetic. *Gin-gina*, literally "the lands" (see § 7), signified "the earth" generally. Besides *ci*, another shortened form of the word, *gi*, was in use. *Ci* or *gi* was probably the original root, to which the formative *n* (the demonstrative) was added.

(9). (*Nam*)- *tsillil* "life". The usual form of the word is *tsilla* or *tsil*, the vowel being affixed when the word is closely attached to an enclitic, and the syllable lengthened by a reduplication of the consonants before the short vowel of the enclitic. Thus Kudur-Mabug says (*nam*)-*tsilla-ni-cu va* (*nam*)-*tsil* * *turmu* (*sar?*) *Larsa-ci-ma-cu mu-naninziq* "for his life and for the life of (? Nit-Tsin), my son, king of Larsa, I built them." *Il* is merely a formative, as in *din-la*, possibly connected with the preposition, and probably a form of the demonstrative (see § 7). The word is another instance of the attempt to intensify by increasing the final syllable. Followed by *e*, the affixed vowel becomes *ī* not *ă*, as in *ganamga* tsillī nenu *gisin ganebgar* "let the mouth, during the life of the king, act". *Nam* is the non-phonetic complement which generally precedes the word. It is the determinative prefix, also, of nouns of relationship. *Nam inna* is rendered "crown of the lord", and *nam-nam* "proclaimer". Compounded with *gar* ("make") it means "soul". Comp. Wot. *nim* "name", *nimo* "renowned"; Mag. *nem* "a generation", *nemi* "descended"; Elamite *numan* "a race". In the sentence quoted above *ganamga* (perhaps for *ca-namga* "mouth-having-speech") seems to mean "mouth"; and under the signification of "crown" an original meaning of "enclosure" may lie

hid. *Nam* was also pronounced *tsim*, and this appears to suggest a primitive relationship to *tsil*, which upon its side may be connected with *nal* "esse". Initial *n* is very liable to change or loss in the Turanian dialects. In Turkish, when compared with cognate dialects, it is either dropped altogether (as in *eng* "very", Mong. *neng*) or changed to *j* or *d* (as in *jadi* "seven", Mand. *nadan, dil* "tongue", Mag. *nyelv*), while the Turk. *j* as often as not expresses an original *z* (*e.g. jaka* "border", Mong. *Zacha. jemek* "eat", Mand. *tse-me*). Another form of the verb in Accadian is *al* or *alei* (Turk. *ol-mek*, Mand. *o-me*, Fin. *olla*, Esth. *ollema*, Basq. *adi* in such forms as *nadin, nindeque*, &c.) Apparently its origin must be sought in the demonstrative.

(10). *Ilzi* or *Ilgi*. The characters which in Assyrian represent *zi* and *gi* have the same form in Accadian. The royal name is preceded by the ideograph of "god", here used as the determinative prefix of a prince. This king can hardly be identified with an Ilzi, of whose brick-legends we possess a small number, and who is mentioned by Nabonidus as the son of the founder of the great Temple of the Moon at Huru, a monarch whose antiquity is very great, and who is in fact the earliest Chaldean sovereign with whom we are acquainted. He has been called Urukh and compared with the Orchamus of Ovid, but upon insufficient grounds. The first element in his name means "lion", pronounced in Accadian *lik* or *liccu*. *Ur* (אר׳) was an *Assyrian* value, the Accadians expressing *ur* by a different character, as on the brick of Rim—(?Tsin), Col. 2. l. 7. The second element is the title of a god, the pronunciation of which is unknown. In one place we find it sounded *zicuv*. Now the legends of these early princes are marked by the absence of postpositions, a sign of antiquity which is not applicable to the present inscription. For this reason I am disinclined to identify the two Ilzis. The Chaldean kings were fond of bearing the names of their predecessors: thus among the kings known to us we have three Nimgirabis and two Kurgaltsus. The following are the inscriptions of Ilgi the son of Liccu*:—(1) One found at Tel-eid near Warka which runs; "(To) the lady of the land of Mar, his Lady, Ilzi, the powerful male, king of the country of Huru, king of the land of Accad, the Temple of Guk-è her high

place, I built". (2) Two from Mugheir:—"Elzi, the powerful male, king of Huru, king of the land of Accad"; and "Elzi, the powerful male, king of Huru, king of the land of Accad, the Temple of Cisaq, the temple of his high place, I built". (3) On a black stone:—"(To) Gingir, Lady of the Temple of Anna, his Lady, Elzi, the powerful male, king of Huru, king of the land of Accad, the Temple of Anna, her place, I founded; its great fortification I built." This Elzi and his father, however, were not the most ancient sovereigns of Chaldea. They were probably the first who made Huru their capital city; but before their time Huruq, "*the* city" as it is written in Accadian, must have asserted its pre-eminence. A large number of these rulers of Huru have preserved their names in brick-legends: besides them we have a list of royal names belonging to one dynasty which seems to have been Elamite. At all events the names, which are translated into Assyrian, show a dialective distinction: thus *mili* is "man" (in Accadian *mulu* and *muluda*), *khali* is "great" (Accadian *gal gula*), *cit* is the "Sun". Lastly, we come to kings with Semitic names and in some cases with Semitic inscriptions. I once endeavoured to show that these represented the Assyrian dynasty of Berosus which began B.C. 1272 (cp. *Herod* I. 95), its leader being probably Khammurabi (an Elamite name by the way) the Semiramis of Berosus. These Assyrians will be the *Casdim* or Semitic "conquerors" of the Old Testament, who descended from Assyria and imposed a Semitic domination upon the primitive Turanian population.

(11) *Us*, "a male". Also *mus* and *vus*. Comp. Zyrianian *yöz* "people".

(12) *Cal-ga*, "powerful". The adjective formed from *cal* or *cala* "strong", by the postposition *ga*.

(13) *Huru-ci-ma-ca-cu*, "(for) all the land of the city of Huru". Huru was the name by which the city was called in Semitic times: it does not follow that such was the Accadian pronunciation. The name is written with the characters which denote "name" and "house", and the Accadian title may have been as different from the Semitic one as *Ca-dimirra* or *Din-Tir* ("Homestead of the Tower") was from *Bab-il*. Huru was the city of the Moon-god, in opposition to Larsa or Zi-par

"the abode of the Sun". *Ci* is added according to the rules of Accadian writing, as the determinative: and it is in this way that we can demonstrate the Accadian origin of Nineveh, Asur, and the other great cities of Assyria. *Ma* follows to express the whole country to which the city of Huru gave its name; and then comes a character, which we find applied to *ma* sometimes, though generally it is omitted. *Ca* signifies "a mouth", hence "a gate" (cf. Turk. *capi*), for which a separate character has been set apart; it is also the determinative prefix of "woman" thus early distinguished as "the talker". Compounded with *zig* for *ziga* it stands for "a seal"; and with *ga* postfixed forms an adjective of extensive use, *e. g. ar-caga* "a people". *Cacaga* ("mouth-speech-making") is "a command"; and the plural *caca* signifies "face" (like פנים)[1]. Hence we get the word used for "in the face of", "above", like *khut* and *cun* expressed by *pa* "speech"; as in *ca-uzga* "top of the water". This meaning becomes adjectival by the addition of *ga; a-caga* is "water-above", *i. e.* "the surface of the ground". *Ma-ca* would therefore be "the whole face" or "surface of the country", in other words "all the country". This explains the employment of *caq* in the signification of "all", the guttural being reduplicated as in *bab, sis, gic,* &c. *Caq* always preceded its noun, as in the longer form *caqabi alsakh* "for all bliss". So *khirda* is "an enclosure", "a crown", *ca-khirda* "a circuit". It is possible that the primary meaning of *ca* itself was "enclosing", "encompassing", like the lips. This use of *ca,* however, in the signification of "all", may have a different origin. In Jakute *diän,* the participle of *diä* "say", Orenburgh *dican* (cp. Acc. *duq*), is affixed to substantives, adjectives, and adverbs, to express that the whole thing asserted is absolutely the fact and nothing else, and may be translated "namely", "extremely". At the end of dependent sentences it stands in the sense of "that", "to wit". Similar is the employment of *dib, div* in other Tataric dialects, of *kelan*

[1] *Caca,* the plural, may be interchanged with *ca,* as in *du-ca* or *du-caca* "a memorial"; *caca* itself alternating with *papa,* of the same signification, "speech", which is expressed by the character which has further values of *miz, sit, rid, laq,* and *kal.*

("saying", "that") in Mongolian, and of *annu* or *yennu* ("saying") in Canarese. *Cu* concludes the whole sentence. It will be noted that the postposition in Accadian follows the last word of the sentence to which it belongs.

(14) *Guza-lal* "throne-supporter" or "councillor". *Guza* (whence the Assyrian *cussu*) means "a seat" (cp. Elamite *kada*, Basque *cudira, coya?*)

(15) *Tur Liq-babi-ge* "son of Liq-babi". *Tur*, properly "small", is used in the general sense of "son", like the Elamite *tur*, Mord. *tsur*. *Nam-tur* has the general sense of "child" (see § 9), while *gi* signified "very small". It is curious that both *tur* (as in *Tartan*) and *gi* also meant "prince". The first syllable of the proper name denoted "a lion": *liccu* is translated *libbu*. The postposition attached to the genitive after *tur* is not common: *tur* in Elamite is distinguished as a strong word, being placed before the governed noun in opposition to *sakri* which comes after it.

(16) *Muna(nis?)-sabba* "I offer sacrifice to him". *Sab* is rendered by the Assyrian *saramu* (to burn in sacrifice); it also signified "to heap" or "fill", as in *sab-gal* "a mound", *sab-tur* "a threshing-floor". The third character in this word is uncertain: I have not been able to identify it with any known sign. Judging from analogy, however, it ought to contain a nasal, probably also a sibilant; and it may be compared with a character one of whose values is *nis*. It may, however, be *ban*.

This verb introduces us to the most important and characteristic part of Accadian Grammar, the pronouns and the verbs. It will first be necessary to treat of the pronouns. The personal pronouns are: (1) *Mu* ("*Ego*") and *idbi-(duru?)*, Gen. *mina* ("mei"), Dat. *dab* ("mihi"), pl. *mi* ("nos"); (2) *Zu* ("tu"), and *iz*, and (?) *mun*, pl. *Zunene* ("vos"); (3) *Ni* or *ene* ("ille") or *in* or *bi* or *abba*, Acc. *mi* or *min* ("se"), pl. *nene* or *li* ("illi"). "Most Turanian languages", says Prof. Max Müller, "besides the usual personal pronouns, have produced a large number of polite or conversational pronouns, such as 'servant', 'Elder Brother', 'Sister', 'Blockhead', &c. Their number becomes smaller with the progress of civilisation and

literary culture. Hence but few traces of them remain in the Tamulic, and hardly any in the Ugric branch[1]". The same may be said of the Accadian. Here we find a compound *idbi-duru* used instead of the first pers. pron. *mu*, from which the dative is formed as in *an-dab-site* "he measures out to me". Owing to a defect in the tablet the reading *duru* is doubtful; it is curiously like the Malay *diri* "self". We may compare the Accadian *dara* "name". *Idbi* may be his "hand" or "slave". So, again, *mun* if used for the 2nd pers. must receive a similar interpretation. *M-n* seems used for all the persons alike: it forms the genitive of the first person, the postposition *na* being affixed to *mu* which is shortened to *mi*, and hence in the conjugation of the negative verb *mal* for *man* is employed as the nominative, *u* being changed, according to rule, to *a*, while *mun* is the prefixed dative; it appears as *min* in the sense of the 2nd pers. after a negative, and perhaps as *mun* in the instance quoted above; and in such cases as *mi-ni-gir* or *min-ni-gir* "he gave it", it is used for the objective case of the 3rd person. It would seem originally to have been merely a demonstrative. In Japanese there are no words specially set apart for the different pronouns; vocables expressive of the ideas of "slave", "body", and so forth, being used for *all* the persons indiscriminately. In Malay and Taic these representatives of the pronouns are very abundant for the first and second persons, though they are not used indiscriminately. The Basque preserves the same phenomenon in the various verbal forms, distinguished by the difference of the incorporated pronouns, which are employed according to the rank or age of the person addressed. With *mu*, *mina* must be compared Fin. *ma* (obj. *minä*), Esth. *ma*, *minna*, Lapp. and Wot. and Mordv. *mon*, Zyr. *me*, Tcherem. *min*, Ost. *ma* (loc. *mana*), Magy. *en*, Samoiedian *man* and *modi*, Elam. *hu* (Gen. *mi*), Basq. *ni*, Mong. and Mands. *bi* (gen. *mini*), Ouigur. *man* (gen. *maning*), Jakute *min* or *bin*. The *n* would be the demonstrative. *Idbi*, *dab* may be compared with *t* the incorporated first pers. pron. nom., and *it* or *id* the same pron. dat. of Basque verbs. *Mi*, the

[1] In Bunsen's *Outlines of the Phil. of Univ. Hist.*, p. 465.

plural, follows the usual Allophylian rule which makes the pronouns alone form their pl. by a modification of the base, instead of by an affix. This occurs even in the Taic dialects, while the Malay pronouns afford the sole instances of a pl. met with in the language. The Ugrian idioms give examples of the same fact in the 1st and 2nd pers., most also in the 3rd: thus for the plural of the 1st pers. we find Fin. *me*, Esth. *meie*, Lapp. and Wot. *mi*, Mord. *min*, Zyr. *mi*, Tcherem. *mä*, Magy. *mi*, Sam. *me*. Basque gives us a new root *gu*. In the Tataric languages this rule does not hold, but it reappears in Mandschu *be* (from *bi*), and *sue* (from *si*); and in Mongolic (Buriatian), which gives us in the 2nd pers. *ta* (from *tschi*).

Zu, or *iz* as it appears in verbs before a consonant, is the Fin. *sa*, Esth. *sa* or *sinna*, Tcherem. *tin*, Wot. and Mordv. *ton*, Zyr. and Magy. *te*, Sam. *tan* and *todi* (pl. *si*), Basque *zu* and *hi* (and *c* in verbs), Turk. *sen*, Jakute *ön* for *zän*, Mands. *si*, and Mong. *zi*. If *mun* be a genuine word, it would remind us of the Basque incorporated dat. fem. *in* "tibi", the only trace of gender to be found in the language. *Zunene* "you + they" is interesting, as finding so many analogies in Turanian languages. The Basque *zute*, the nom. pl. of the incorporated 2nd pron. is compounded of *zu* ("tu") and *te* ("illi") exactly as is the Accadian. Böhtlingk resolves the Jakute *bis-ig* ("vos", Turk. *biz*) into *bin* + *zan* ("ego + tu") and *äz-igi* ("vos", Turk. *siz*) into *zan* + *zan* ("tu + *tu*")[1]. The Buriat. *bida* ("nos"), seems to be "ego + ille".

The 3rd pers. is properly the demonstrative, which originally began with a guttural. Its usual forms are *ene*, *in* or *an* (the latter after an *a*-sound), which become *ni* or *ne* when preceded by a vowel. The pl. is another instance of the primitive mode of forming the plural in this class of languages, *nene* is "ille + ille". Comp. Basq. *a* (and the demonst. *on-ec*) and in verbs the acc. *d* ("illum") and nom. *te* or *zte* ("illi"), Fin. *ne* ("illi"), Zyr. *nya* ("illi"), gen. *ny-län*, Tcherem. *ninä* ("illi"), Esth. *ta*, *temma* ("ille") and *neet*, *nummad* ("illi"), Jakute *kini* ("ille"), Turk. *ol* (pl. *an-lar*), Buriat. *ene*, Tungusic *-n*.

[1] *Ueber d. Sprache d. Jakuten*, p. 168.

The second form *bi* which is equally singular and pl. refers us to the Basque *be* which forms the poss. *bere* ("his" and "their") as well as *be-r-au* ("himself"). Comp., -too, Turk. *bu* ("hic"), Jak. *by* and *ba* ("hic"), Samoi. *pu-da* ("his", = "he + his"), Fin. *pi* or *vi* in verbs. *Bi* becomes, according to rule, *ib*, *ub*, *ab*, and *ba*, as well as *abba*. We find *mi* or *min* prefixed to the verbal nominative, sometimes, to denote the accusative. It may be a bye-form of *bi*, but it is more probably an independently developed demonstrative. In the Taic idioms *man* "he" seems to have its source in *annai* ("this"), *annan* ("that"). There is no distinction of gender in the Accadian pronouns. This applies equally to the Basque and the Ugric and Tataric languages, thereby distinguishing them from the Tamulic.

The Poss. Prons.:—These are postfixed, as in the Ugric, the Tataric, the Mongolic, and the Tungusic, the Taic and the Malay; the reverse being the case in the Tamulic, Lohitic, Chinese, and Caucasian Bhotiya, as well as in Basque, except in the case of the vocative. The Accadian possessives are merely the personal pronouns placed after a noun, instead of standing alone, or of being prefixed as in verbs. They are, (1) *mu*, (2) *zu*, (3) *ni* or *na* or *ani* (after a vowel) and *bi*, (4)..., (5)..., (6) *nene* and *bi*. The simple pronouns following their noun denote the possessives in the same way, in the Taic, and Malay, the Tungusic, Mongolic, Tataric, and Ugric, though the final vowel is always dropped in the latter class of languages and generally in the Mongolic and Tataric. In the 3rd pers. *bi* there is no more distinction of number than there is between the sing. and pl. of the 3rd pers. in Basque, Finnish, Ostiak, and Buriat.

The demonstrative pronouns:—These may all, as I have already indicated, be traced back to *gan* or *kan*, which sometimes occurs instead of *mi(n)* as the prefix of the 3rd pers. acc., *e.g. gannib-tuqtuq* "he possessed it", and which is probably the origin of the substantive verb *gan* or *kan* (like Turk. *ol-meq* and *ol*). The guttural is still found in the Jak. *kini* "he", with which we may compare the Elamite *khi* "this" and *khu* "that", as well as *khir* "him". An inscription of Curi-galsu

has *khu-mun-ziq* instead of the usual *mu-na-ziq* or *mu-nan-ziq*, and this *khu* for *kha*, according to the law of vowels, I should be inclined to refer to the demonstrative, final *n* being omitted, as in *mi-* for *min-*. Other forms of the demonstrative in Accadian are *na* and *nam*, which at once take us to the 3rd pers. pron. and the genitive postposition. (Cf. § 3 (10).)

The relative pronoun:—This, as I have said above (§ 4), is *gum* or *cū* ("a man"). As in the Basque, the relative is used only with the participle, the pronouns being pleonastically prefixed to the verbal form, just as if no relative had been expressed. The Basque phrase *ceñac min egin diden* "which has made me ill", where *ceñ-ac* is the relative, *d-* the prefixed nom. "ille" and *n* the participial ending, is an exact parallel to an Accadian sentence. Of the Tataric and Mongolic dialects Osmanli alone has developed an independent prefixed relative *kim* or *ki*, probably of the same origin as the Accadian. In the other dialects this relative is still an affix, *ki* or *gi* (*e.g. naghor-de-ki* "which is in the lake"), used like the Mandschu *-ngge*, as in *aracha-ngge* (lit. "written-having") "qui scripsit", *mi-ningge* ("mine-what-is") "das meinige", *ininge* ("his-what-is") "das seinige"; the latter re-appear in Mongol. *minüge* or *ekonüge*, Osmanli *mininghi*. These terminations may, however, go back to the Accadian postpositions *ge* or *ga*. At any rate the interrogative, in Mong. *kes*, Esth. *kes*, *ke*, Hung. *ki* (and *kihi* "quicunque"), Fin. *kuka*, Lapp. *ku*, *gi*, Wot. *kin*, has the same root as *guv*.

The reciprocal pronoun:—This is *barta-bi*, *barta-bi-cu* being "with" or "among one another".

I should explain the word as compounded of *barta* the infin. of *bar* "to bind", and *bi* "their", so that its literal meaning would be "their combination".

The indefinite pronouns:—We find, first, *udbab*, "any one", if that is the right reading. *Udbab-cu* is "in any case". The derivation may be *id* "one", and the reduplicated form of *bi* which occurs in *bab-ac* "he has made", *su-bab-te-e* "he takes", *bab-zig-ine* "they raise". Another indefinite pron. is *bamu*, as in *a-bamu-ran-sem* "let no one give".

The pronouns introduce us to the verbs, which are little else

than the bare roots with the pronouns attached. These are generally *prefixed*, in contradistinction to the use of the noun with its possessive. Thus *khir-mu* would be "my writing", *mu-khir* "I wrote". This is the simplest kind of grammatical machinery, and is justified by logical relations which make the person primary in thought in the verb, and secondary when used as a possessive. Modern Turanian languages have advanced beyond this primitive stage of mere juxtaposition, and the more polished tongues, those of the Ugrian group namely, have corroded the pronouns almost to the form of inflectional terminations, and have moreover affixed them not only in the case of nouns but also in the case of verbs, with two important exceptions. These are Basque and Tungusic. The Tungusic idioms are the least developed of all the Altaic languages, and are therefore likely to have best preserved the original forms of agglutinative grammar. In Mandschu, as in Accadian, the simple position of the pron. before the root creates a person of the verb, *bi-thege, si-thege* are "I dwell", "thou dwellest", like Accadian *mu-tuq, iz-tuq*. Among the tribes of Nyertshinsk, however, Castrén found that affixes had been added even to Tungusic verbs to distinguish the persons, and the Mongolic shows no traces of prefixed pronouns. Here, as in other Turanian languages, the possessive and verbal suffixes are kept distinct, while an attempt is made to restrict roots to being used either as verbs or as nouns alone. Basque is the only advanced language of this family which has preserved the original position of the pronouns. The auxiliary *izate* has the nom. pr. always prefixed, the other auxiliary observing the same rule in the imperfects and the conditional. The present tenses of this last auxiliary, however, have it postfixed, and the same indecision is already marked in Accadian. Usually, as I have said, the subject pronoun precedes, but we find not only *in-semmu* "he gives", *in-sem* "he gave", but also *semmu-nin, sem-nin,* not only *in-gur* "he restored", but also *gur-nin,* not only *in-male* "he dwells", but also *malenin,* not only *nin-segi* "he heaped up", but also *segi-nin;* while *inu-mu* is regularly "I am lord" as well as "my lord". *Dibdib-ne,* again, is "they bring back", and *ziku-na* seems to mean "he makes". So, too,

ne-garrinna is "he throws", but *garrina-zu* "thou throwest". The Accadian verb thus shows the primitive mechanism of the agglutinative languages, and marks out the stage of development already attained. The Taic idioms (like the Chinese) prefix the verbal pronouns; so too do the Bhotiya and Lohitic, though here the possessive is also prefixed as in Tamulic. The same is the case with Malay.

The most distinguishing feature of the Accadian verb is the incorporation of the pronouns. Thus *in-sem* "he gave", *in-nan-sem* "he gave him". The pronouns used are those of which we have already spoken, the two forms of the 3rd pers., *in* and *bi* being equally common. There are, besides, two sets employed, one for preceding the nom. pron., and one for being inserted between the nom. pron. and the root. The most frequent are, necessarily, those of the third person. This is in full *nan* in the sing., *nanin* in the pl., but *nan* often becomes merely *na*, as in *mu-na-ziq* "I built it", or simple *n* as in *ban-sem* "he gave it"; in some cases this *n* is even omitted altogether, or rather assimilated to the following letter; thus *ba-bat* "he slew him" stands for *ban-bat*. The plural *nanin* occurs in the legends of Kudur-Mabuq and Khammurabi, referring to the temples those kings had built; but it may, after *bā*, be used as a lengthened form of the singular, *e.g. ban-nanin-khir* "he wrote it", where the first nasal represents the long *ā*. The second nasal in the form *nen-sem* is merely euphonic, though it may denote the accusative (*e.g. nen-khir* "he enclosed it") if the verb be preceded by a word which ends in a vowel other than *i*, or in the semi-vowels *m* or *v*. The rule is that any vowel (except *i*) or semi-vowel *m* or *v* requires the succeeding pronoun, if it be not the second form of the 3rd person (*bi*), to begin with a consonant, although we find *mukh-bi an-de-e* "he strikes him", but here, perhaps, a *ba* has dropped out of the text (comp. *il-bi ban-tsir* "its foundation he strengthened"). The second form of the 3rd pers., however, preferably begins with the vowel if not immediately followed by an incorporated pronoun. This must always happen before a following *t*: thus we must write *ib-tan-uddu*, *ib-tuqtuq*, *ib-turri*. On the other hand, *d* may have the nasal before it. At the

beginning of the sentence the vowel-forms, *in, an, un* are employed. These are regulated by the last vowel of the word immediately preceding, unless this be a post-position, or a possessive pronoun. The second form of the 3rd pers. pron. is preferably used in an intensive sense, translated by the Assyrian pael and the secondary conjugations which insert *t*. The full form is *abba*, but this becomes *bab*, when followed by the verbal root and preceded by a short vowel. If long *ā*, however, precedes, *ab* is used. Before an incorporated pronoun the initial vowel falls away altogether, or coalesces with the final vowel of the preceding word if the last syllable of the latter be open. So far as I have observed, *ib* always occurs before *t*, whatever the preceding vowel-sound may be except short *ă*. In only one instance is *t* preceded by a nasal, and then the verb is passive (*an-ta-dudunmu*[1]). Besides the incorporated accusatives (*a*)*n-*, *-nan*, (*a*)*nnan-*, *-nanin-* which all require *b*(*a*), not *ab*, *ib*, or *ub*, this secondary form of the 3rd pers. may be also used with the incorporated pron. of the 1st pers. In this case, however, the latter pronoun will belong to the first of the two sets of pronouns I mentioned above, those namely which are prefixed, not inserted. The secondary form of the third pers. pron. may be itself incorporated. Thus while *ga-gar* for *gan-gar* is "let him do", *gan-eb-gar* is "let him do it". We even find a combination of the two forms in *bannab-lal-e* "he weighs out it", and in *gan-in-ban-tsil* "let him give life to him"; though here I should rather explain the form as the incorporation of two pronouns, one for the accusative and the other for the dative, the dative, as in *dab* "mihi", preferring the form with *b*. *Bannab-lal-e*, therefore, would not be exactly parallel to *bannan-duq*, but rather *banna-b-lal-e* "he weighs it out for him", while the 3rd nasal in *gan-in-ban-tsīl* would be euphonic. As in Basque, there is no difference of number expressed by the pronouns, except in that of the first person. *In, nin, nanin,* and *bi* are all equally singular and plural, and when incorporated their number can only be known by a reference to their object. But this can never be obscure as the object is always expressed.

[1] The nom. pron. here is probably influenced by the double *d* of the root.

When the number of the subject is to be signified, the plural affixes are attached to the root. Of these I shall speak presently. The incorporated pronoun of the first person, which I have as yet found only in the dative, is *dab: e.g. an-dab-sit-e* "it measures" or "counts for me", and Amar- (?Sin) says that he is "king of the strong foe", *bab-dab-kurri-a,* "who was hostile to me". I have not come across the pronoun of the 2nd person.

Besides these incorporated pronouns, there is another set which is prefixed to the subject pronoun instead of following it. These all belong to the form *m-n,* and thus seem, like the demonstrative *gan* when used in the same way, to have retained some consciousness of their originally independent signification which may be referred to the root *min, minna* "size", "great" (cp. Jak. *manga* "great"). The 3rd pers. is *min,* contracted to *mi;* e.g. *min-in-gub* "he strengthened it", *min-in-zu* "he added it", *min-in-sem* "he gave him", *mi-ni-ti* "he enslaved him". The first pers. is *mun,* as in *mun-nab-zige* "he strengthened me" (where the *n* is doubled to express the length of the preceding syllable), and *khul-mun-s-ib* "he greatly adored(?) me". The last example shows us how the pronouns were incorporated when the nominative pronoun followed, instead of preceding, the root. This system of incorporation, so characteristic a feature of the Accadian, is not to be found in any of the languages of the old world, with two marked exceptions. These are the Basque, and more obscurely the Mordvinian. In the latter language the verbal terminations are: Sing. 1st pers. *-m-ak* (= "me + tu"), *-mam* (= "me + ille"), *-m-isk* (= "me + vos"); 2nd pers. *-t-an* (= "te + ego"), *-nz-at* (= "ille + te"), *-d-ez* (= vobis + illud"); 3rd pers. *-ze* (= "illud"), *-n-k* ("illud + vos"); Pl., 1st pers. *-m-isk* (= "nos + tu"), *-m-ia* (= "nos + illi"). In Basque, the system of incorporation prevails even more extensively than in Accadian. The numberless verbal forms are distinguished from one another by the difference of form or of position in the pronouns which they contain though now through lapse of time greatly corrupted, and disfigured. Like the Accadian the Basque requires the objective pronoun as well as the object itself to be expressed. The incorporation of the pronouns,

however, only takes place in the first auxiliary, though *izak* in the imperfect seems to contain an accusative, *ni-n-ze-n*, *hi-n-ze-n*, etc., the final nasal being the sign of the tense. The second *n* may, however, be merely euphonic. Now it is in the first auxiliary that the nom. pronouns are generally postfixed: hence we must compare forms like *n-a-zu* ("me-habes-tu") and *min-du-zu-n* ("me-habuisti-tu") with such words as *mun-nab-ziga* or *khul-mun-si-b*. Except in forms like *z-id-d-a-n* ("tu-illum-mihi-habuisti"), the Basque avoids bringing the nom. and the acc. and dat. pronouns together, the nom. being generally relegated to the end of the root. This is not the case, as we have seen, in Mordvinian, where the forms bear a close resemblance to *khul-mun-s-ib* which without the inserted intensive sibilant would be *khul-mun-nib*. In the ordinary Basque verbs, other than the auxiliaries, the nom. pron. is postfixed, the acc. being prefixed, e.g. *d-aki-t* "illud-scit-ille", the plural being denoted by *tzi* inserted between the root and the nominative.

Besides the machinery of the pronouns, the Accadian verb employs a number of auxiliary words to denote what in other languages would be expressed by tenses and conjugations. In one instance, however, it has recourse to a genuine internal modification of the root. As in most Turanian idioms, the only radical distinction of time that is known is that between the past and the present. The past tense has the bare root; while the present is marked by a prolongation of the root, the last consonant being doubled and a corresponding short vowel added. This dwelling upon the idea is the most natural way of expressing present time. We find the same contrivance in the Tibetan and Bhotiya dialects; thus from *jyed* "to do" we get *nga jded-do* "I am doing". It is similar to the mode in which abstracts are produced (see § 2). In the Ugric languages, again, the difference between the two tenses is set forth by a difference in the suffixed pronouns, which are shortened in the preterite. So, too, in Tamulic the shorter personal terminations are used for the past, the fuller for the present. The infinitive is denoted, as in other Turanian languages, by a postposition. This is *ta* with which the Basque verbal subst. in *-te* may be compared. Thus the negative root *mia* becomes *mia-ta*

"non-esse". The postposition *cu* is also used for the same purpose, e.g. *ci-cidan-bi-cu* "to (be) with him". This is identical with the Mong. *ku* as in *bŭ-kŭ* "to be", and the Basque characteristic of the destinative *ko* as in *izaiteko* "to be".

Of the participle I have already spoken (§ 4). It is expressed by the affix *ā*, which is not to be confounded with *ă* the sign of the present sing. of *a-* verbs. This *ā* is added after a preceding short *ă*, and it follows vowels of all kinds. Thus *garra-ā* "which is made", *cus-va* for *cusu-ā* "rest", *cacava* "said", (i.e. "the end") where the first vowels denote the pass. The plural seems to be formed by a reduplication of the ending; e.g. *gut dadunai* "bulls who go frequently". A participle, or rather a *nomen agentis*, which cannot be used as a relative, may also be formed by an external addition. This is the prefix *ci*, probably for the postposition *cit*, (see § 3, (1)). Thus from *bal* "transgress", we have *ci-bal* "transgressor" or "rebel" both masc. and fem., and the common *ci-āca* "high place" or "exalting" seems derived in the same way from *aca* "high".

The plural of the two tenses is distinguished by the employment of the two words which represent plurality. *Ene* denotes the present, *(m)es* the past. *Ene* becomes *ine, ane,* and *une* when the 3rd sing. ends in *i, a,* and *u;* in some cases it is contracted to *ne*. *Mes*, as I have remarked before, affords an instance of the progress of phonetic corruption in Accadian, being only found in the shortened forms *-es, -as,* and *-us*. When, however, the root ended in *m*, this letter was doubled; thus *in-sem-mus* "they gave". The same careful distinction between the vowels is exemplified in Elamite, where the vowels of the personal terminations differ according to the vowel of the root (e.g. *turnas* "they knew", *cusis* "they built", *bitus* "they obtained"). In Basque the mark of the plural *tzi* is inserted between the root and the postfixed nom. pron. in ordinary verbs, e.g. *d-aki-tzi-t* "he knows them"; in the form of *it*, it is inserted into the root itself of the auxiliary. Other parts of the verb are created by the means usually employed by the Turanian languages. I have not found any instance of the future. In the allied languages this is mostly marked by the root *ra* or *ar* (as in Tatar, Mong., Mands. and Elamite, the

Mag. fut. part. being expressed by the same syllable). In Basque the fut. infin. is marked by the postposition *ra*, which may explain the original sense of the particle. In Accadian, however, *ra* gives an intensive force to the verb, translated by the secondary conjugations of the Assyrian, just as in Tataric and Mongolic *ar*, *z*, or *ra* form Inchoatives and Neuters. The root *ra* primarily signifies to "inundate", and is placed immediately before the verbal base, and after the pronouns; e.g. *ba-ra-tur* "he altogether crossed over", *ba-ra-uddu* "he went fully out", *ba-ra-uddu-ne* "they go fully out". The 3rd pers. pron. has always the form *ba* before it. The negative is inserted between *ra* and the verbal root, its final vowel being dropped, e.g. *ba-rā-n-tee-ene* "they do not fully take". The precative prefix becomes *kha*, as *kha-ba-ra-uddu* "let him fully go forth", *kha-ba-rā-n-male* "let no one dwell", *kha-ba-rā-n-duzzu* "let him not seize".

Another intensive form is that with *su* or *si*. This is inserted between the nom. and acc. pronouns. Thus we find *in-s-in-sem* "he gave them a price", *in-s-in-semmus* "they gave them a price", *in-s-in-semmu* "he gives them attestation", *in-s-in-semmune* "they give them attestation", *mu-s-in-sem* "I gave it all", *in-s-in-zu* "he despoiled him", *nu-ban-s-in-duz* "he did not quite seize him", *khul-mun-s-ib* "he fully adored (?) me", When the accusative was not expressed, this intensive was prefixed under the form of *su;* thus *su-semmu* "a gift" (unless *su* here be for *sev*, the root being doubled to denote the passive), *su-nu-n-barra* "he does not at all abandon", *su-nenin-ak-ā* "who have made" in Khammurabi's inscription. If *su* were the original form of the word, it might be connected with an old root which meant "hand" and which is similarly cut off by the pronouns from the verb with which it forms one word and prefixed, as in *su-nen-ti* "he took" (see § 6). If *si*, it would signify "presence", "on the spot". In the Turkish-Tatar dialects *s* or *iz*, affixed to the root makes the cooperatives and reciprocals.

The Accadian had yet another intensive form. This was the prefix *immi* or *imma* which originally signified "a flood", *im* being "rain". An ancient Accadian ritual speaks of *immi-*

ne (*dimir*) *Na an-libista* "the exceeding flood (lit. "floods") of Anu (נח) in the midst of heaven". The prefix several times occurs in the brick-legends of the kings. In the bilingual tablets we find *immi-nin-durgas* "they died of plague", *num-ma-s-in-gi* "he does not urge on" (where, however, the Assyrian has the future). The latter example gives us the double intensive *si* as well as *immi*. Comp. *m* which builds factive verbs in Zyr., Tcherem., and Wotiak.

The precative was formed by prefixing *ga*, which when followed immediately by *ba* became *kha* and even *a*. Examples are *ga-n-dagga* "may he restore", *ga-nin-ban-tsil* "may he give him life", *ga-neb-gar* "may he make", *ga-gar* (for *ga-n-gar*) the same, *ga-paga* (for *ga-n-paga*) "may he fight" (whence *ga-paga durga*, "may he die in battle", lit. "may he battle death"), *kha-ba-ra-uddu* "may he utterly go forth", *kha-bab-dibdib-ene* "may they bring back", *kha-ba-ra-n-male* "let no one dwell", *kha-ba-ra-n-duzzu* "let him fully take it"[1], *a-ba-nin-duz* "let him take it", *a-bamu-ra-n-sem* "let no one at all give". *Kha* seems to be changed to *ā* after a preceding *ă*. The Accadian vowels were probably strongly aspirated at the beginning of a word. A guttural pronunciation is largely affected by all primitive languages, more especially by the Allophylian in which every word keeps intact its full sound, phonetic corruption being contrary to the genius of the speech. Thus the river *Idiklat* is written חדקל in Hebrew, and the Elamite *khapar* "high" is apparently connected with the Accadian *bar*. The original form of this *ga* was, I believe, *gan*, the substantive verb; the force of the prefix being, "since it is so, he", etc. Comp. the Basq. affix of the Conditional and Potential *-ke*. In the latter language the characteristics of the various tenses are postfixed to the root, with the exception of *d*, the mark of the present in the Indic., Condit., and Pot., which is prefixed. *Era-(zo)*, also, the formative of the causative, may precede the verbal-root, and *ecin* which denotes the Prohibitive always stands before the radix. The same is the case with *oi*, the

[1] In this instance it will be noticed that the form of the objective pron. is the same as that of the inserted negative.

characteristic of the Frequentative, and with *ba*, the characteristic of the impersonal "There is". The potential has an affix *al*.

The causative is formed by the insertion of *tan* or *dan*, which sometimes loses its *n*, between the root and the pronouns. E.g. *ib-tan-tur* "he caused to cross over", *ib-tan-uddu* "he caused to go out", *ib-tan-gubbus* "they caused to be strengthened", *ib-tan-zi* "he caused to take", *in-da-nal* "he caused to exist", *ba-n-da-gic* "he caused to be strange", *an-ta-dudumu* "it is constantly made to go". *Dan* means "strong", "able". It coincides with the causative suffixes of the Ugrian and Turkic tongues which are attached to the root; *tan* in Finnish, *tam* in Lapp., *ta* in Zyr., *t* in Wot., *tar* or *dar* in the Turkic-Tataric languages. The Basque *era* (*zo*) has lost an initial *d*.

The Frequentative. This is formed very simply, by the reduplication of the root, much in the same way that the Ugric dialects so frequently repeat the characteristics of the frequentative and the middle. Thus *ib-tuq-tuq* "he had frequently" i.e. he "possessed", *al-malmal* "he inhabited" (*al malè* being "he fortifies"), *dadunà* "he who marches often". This reduplication is also used to express the passive, or rather the middle, Accadian properly possessing no passive voice. E.g. *sukh* is "kidnapping", *sukh-sukh* "being robbed"; *bar* is "bind", *barbar* "bound together", i.e. "a number of tablets"; *gar* "to make", *gagarra* "made", i.e. "existing". Here the first member of the reduplication is euphonically shortened and the second syllable lengthened, the last being the form most proper to the passive. It is the same machinery that is used to produce the present, though here applied to express a permanent result. It reminds us of the Mordvinian characteristic of the passive *va*. In this point the Accadian shows its agreement with the Ugric idioms, in contrast to such Allophylian languages as Taic, Chinese, Malay, and Tamulic, by not appropriating any independent word to the formation of the passive, but creating it so far as it exists at all from the inward resources of the root. The passive is used mostly in the participle, and this generally is without the attached pronouns. Thus *gagarrā* and *garrā* "made", hence "existing" (for *garra-à* which is written in an ancient inscrip-

tion), *cusva* (for *cusu-à*) "rested", *dumu* for *dum-vu* "made to go", which with the participial ending attached appears as *duma* or *duva*, i.e. *dunu-a*, *gubbā* (for *gubva*) "fortified", *gan-va* "been" &c. The addition of the pronouns seems to have been felt as inconsistent with the impersonal non-active character of the voice; though rarely the pronouns were omitted in the other forms of the verb after the subject and object had been expressed. So, too, in Basque incorporated pronouns might be used together with an expressed subject or object. This cannot take place in languages like the Taic and the Malay, where each word retains its independent, isolated existence, and cannot in any way be combined with another so as to form the general idea of a sentence.

The Negative Verb is as marked a characteristic of the Accadian, as it is of the Ugric, Tataric, and Basque, as well as of the Tamulic. It appears in two forms, the first combining the verb with the negative particle, the second being the regular negative verb. The negative conjugation inserts or prefixes the particle *nŭ* "not" according to circumstances. When the simple root is used with the pronouns, the negative precedes the latter, the initial vowel of the pronoun being lost (except in the case of the second form of the 3rd pers.); e.g. *nub-use* "he does not subdue", *nub-ziqa* "he does not found", *nun-zu-a* "he who knows not". If, however, a formative is added to the root, the negative is placed between it and the root, losing its vowel in its turn, e.g. *ba-ra-n-uddu* "he goes not forth at all", *ba-ra-n-teeene* "they do not take at all"; unless the formative be prefixed to the pronouns, when, whether it may precede or follow the latter, in either case it makes its vowel prevail; e.g. *su-nu-n-barra* "they do not abandon", *num-ma-s-ingi* "he does not urge on", *num-mu-n-s-in-male* "he does not fortify it". Before *ba*, which seems to have a long vowel, *nu* becomes *nam* or *nab*, as in *nam-ba-lale* "he does not fill at all". *Nu* is constantly used with participles, as *nu-cusva* "unrested", adjectives, as *nu-sega* "unloving", and even substantives, as *nu dara* "not a name[1]".

[1] Mr George Smith (*North Brit. Rev.* Jan. 1870), draws attention to the fact that the negative may be inserted into the body of a word (like the plural sign in Basque verbs). Thus *'sidi* is "pure", *'si-nu-di* "impure."

It is also found with the negative verb, intensifying the negative, e.g. *nin-mu nu mia* "my wife thou (art) not", *kharra nu mia* "a man not being". In the Ugric dialects the negative is combined with the pronoun which is inserted between it and the verbal root, exactly as in Accadian. This negative is *ön* or *en* as is clear from the imperative where it appears in full; with which compare Zyr. *en* and Elam. *anu* used with imperatives only. The negative in substantives and adjectives is an affix. In Basque, the negative particle *ez* is prefixed to the root. The negative *me* in Osmanli immediately follows the root or the affixes which modify the root. The Tataric *me*, Mong. *ume*, Ugric *nem* (which perhaps contains both negatives) conducts us to the regular Accadian negative verb *mia*. The root *mia*, which by the addition of the pronouns becomes a verb, signifies "not being". In the singular it is conjugated thus: *mia za-e min*, "thou art not", *mia ene* "he is not", *mia-ta* "I am not". *Mia za-e min* is literally "a not-being (art) thou thou-there[1]". *Zu* becomes *za* before the connecting vowel *e*, *a* + *e* being probably pronounced as a diphthong, while *min* is the second form of the 2nd pers., primarily the demonstrative, like Mong. *me*, Tatar. *ma* (from the dem. *man*) "there hast thou". Its similarity of sound to *mia* apparently causes it to be used with the latter. Hence it comes to have a kind of negative force, like *personne, jamais*. Still if used as a negative it seems to require a preceding *nu;* e.g. *dam-mu nu min* "my wife thou (art) not[2]". *Mia-ta* is properly the infinitive formed by the post-position *ta;* the first person being understood in the speaker. Standing alone it is the infinitive simply, and requires the addition of other words to make it the first person. Besides this conjugation, *mia* has also the participle of the substantive verb *gan* (for

[1] We find similar repetitions of the pronouns in the allied languages. Thus Jakute *min-agha-bin* "I am a father", literally "I-a father-I", or the Basque *ni hilsen niz* (lit. "I dying I am").

[2] One example, however, apparently uses it alone in a negative sense. This is the phrase *ai-'su cicu-ani-nav iz-da-paggekha-min* which is rendered "thy father on his seat thou doest not seat", the Assyrian verb being *tugallat*, the pael pres. from a root which is probably allied to جلس. As, however, the first character has the usual value of *ne*, and *nav.* ought not to be followed by a vowel, it is possible that *tugallat* is the 3rd pers. fem.

gandà) attached. The infinitive has then to be used, preceding the verb like any other accusative. The absolute form is *mia-ta ă-an*, *ă* being the connecting vowel after the preceding *ta*, and *an*, probably pronounced *han* or rather *khan*, being the substantive verb. This is another instance of phonetic decay in Accadian. *A-an* is a common affix, added like *gan* or *ganva*, with a connecting vowel. Owing to its use and the fact that its vowels belong to the guttural class the hard *g* has become modified. The singular of the new form of the negative verb is thus conjugated; *mia-ta mal-e-gan* (for *man-e-gan*) "I am not", *mia-ta zăa-gan* "thou art not", *mia-ta en-e-gan* "he is not": and the bilingual tablet adds further *mia-ta-ta* "from not-being".

The Accadian sometimes attaches another particle in a curious way. This is *va* "and" (?comp. Wot. *i*) which has often the position which it requires in European languages; but it may be prefixed to the verb which it couples with the next sentence, as in *va-ne-cu* "he captured and". Another word for the conjunction was *cama* or *cava*. It may be the passive part. of *ca*, "it being said"; but cp. Elamite *aak*, and *cutta* ("and"), Mordw. *yak*.

The following will be the forms of the simple conjugation:—

PERFECT.

Mu-zig, "I built" (on the bricks of Elzi and Ismi-Dagon[1]).
Mu-na-zig, "I built it"
Mu-n-zig, „
Mu-nan-zig, „
Mu-nanin-zig, "I built them"
in-zig, "he built"
zig-nin, „
an-sem, "he gave"
nin-khir "he surrounded"
ni-dun, "he went"
ba-nuv, "he raised"
abba-gur, "he restored"
in-nin-zig, "he built it"
ni-nin-zu, "he added it"
in-nan-gur, "he restored it"
ba-n-tsir, "he fortified it"
ban-nanin-khir, "he wrote it"
mi-ni-gir, "he gave it"
min-in-gub, "he strengthened it"
in-gin-es, "they placed"
min-ak-es, "they made"
ib-zigis, "they raised"
&c.

[1] I should rather read the name *Issep-Dagon*, from *issep* "a prince".

PRESENT.

in-lal-e, "he fills"
ba-lal-e, "he fills"
ni-lal-e, "he fills"
inu-mu, "I am lord" (cp. Mord. *paz-an*, "I am lord").
iz-dun-e, "thou goest"
nin-garri, "he does"
bab-gubba, "he fortifies"
ib-turri, "he crosses"
male-nin, "he dwells"
ub-use, "he subdues"
ba-n-khaa, "he slays him"
ne-garrinna, "he throws down"
an-ake, "he weighs"
al-gubba, "he fortifies"
ba-nnab-lale, "he weighs it"
ba-nnan-ca, "he addresses her"
an-dab-sit-e, "he measures for me"
mun-nab-ziga, "he strengthens for me"
mun-giddhu, "thou spoilest"
garrinna-zu, "thou throwest down"
in-semmune, "they give"
in-garrine, "they do"
in-lalene, "they weigh"
&c.

Before concluding this part of the subject, I have to draw attention to a remarkable fact. Not only are the pronouns incorporated, but in some cases the system of incorporation is extended even to substantives. In the other Turanian languages, the Turkic for instance, as well as in Accadian, verbal roots are incorporated, as I have already shown, whereby the various conjugations are formed. But in Accadian, a substantive containing the same letters as the verb may be incorporated, an agglutinative representative, as it may be described, of the cognate accusative of other tongues. Thus we find *ab-'sub-'subbi* "he builds a building". This will show us more closely the origin of the similar formation in Frequentatives, Causatives, and Passives. The root it must be remembered, without suffixes or without a position in a sentence, is not a part of speech at all.

It will now be necessary to state in general terms the vowel-harmony of the Accadian. In the most primitive Turanian idioms, the Mandschu for example, polysyllabic words require the same vowels. This is also largely carried out in Accadian, *e.g. gurus, amas.* It does not prevail, however, universally. But in combination, the vowels are always more or less influenced by succeeding or preceding syllables. I have already stated the rules which govern this in the case

of the verbal pronoun suffixes, as well as in the case of the lengthened root-forms. I have only to add that when the root is reduplicated, the first (short) syllable is affected by the final syllable if long; thus it is *dă-duná*, but *dŭdumù*. When a modifying verbal root is inserted into the body of a verbal form, should its vowel be *a*, *ă* or *ĭ* must precede. In other cases the vowel-harmony will be *ă* and *i* after *ŭ*, *ŭ* after *ū* and *ev*, *e* after *i*, and *e*, *i* or *a* after *a*.

(17) (?*Sar*)-*mu*, "my king". It may also be "I am king".

(18) ... *di-ga-ca-ni*, "all his final ..." The line is unfortunately mutilated, and the reading *dí* is not quite certain. *Di* signifies "to end", "to set", also "to judge", while *didi* is "to possess", "conquer".

(19) *Ga-n-tsillil*, "may he give life". The longer, emphatic form is used, though *gan-tsilli* would have been sufficient. The insertion of the predicate shortens the form; thus "may he give him life" is *ga-nin-ban-tsil*, not *tsilli* or *tsillil*.

(20) *Mu-bi*, "his name" or "memorial". This is the ordinary meaning of *mu*, as in *mu-khir* ("name-writing"), "a tablet". It is also translated "very great", and "prince". It further signifies "a year", and "to give".

The above contains all that I have been able to collect upon the subject of Accadian Grammar. That it belongs to a primitive epoch in agglutinative speech is evident. It only remains to discuss the languages to which it is most nearly related. Throughout this paper I have used "Allophylian" as synonymous with "Agglutinative", comprising the various Asiatic families of speech known as Taic, Malay, Tamulic, Bhotiya, Tibeto-Caucasian, &c.; while I have confined the term "Turanian" to a group of tongues—Mongolic, Tungusic, Tataric, and Ugric—whose unity of origin has, I conceive, been fully proven by German writers. In the last-named family must be included the Basque, as has been shown by the labours of Prince Lucien Bonaparte, Charencey, and others. A continuation of W. Von Humboldt's researches on local names has extended the range of the Basque across the south of Europe as far as Asia Minor, and the sub-family thus formed may be conveniently named Iberian. To the Ugric idioms, specially,

out of the Ural-Altaic family, the Basque affords many and striking similarities. At the same time, Basque has preserved, beyond any other language of the Old World, distinct traces of those primitive contrivances of speech which have so far become obliterated in the Finnic dialects as to make these approach somewhat to the perfection of inflective languages. Still, the Finnic dialects are stamped both in structure and in grammar with an unmistakeable Turanian imprint. Great as may be the distance between the Mandschu and the Wotiak, it is one of degree only, not of kind, which is bridged over by the intervening idioms. At first sight, the Accadian and the Elamite seem widely separate, so much so as to justify the old title "king of tongues (*uccu*) and of Accad", which alternated with "Sumir and Accad", or the phrase perhaps derived from Arab neighbours "the four peoples" (the גוים of Gen. xiv. 1); but a close survey, while relegating the Elamite to the Ugric division and the Accadian to another and less developed stock, will assert their primitive connexion. I lay no stress here upon a community of words such as *a* "water", *mili* or *mulu* "man", *tur* "son", &c., because these might have been easily borrowed; but the spirit of the two grammars, and the store of formal elements used by both, are identical. Granting, however, that each belongs to the same Turanian family, we want to know more closely to what particular subdivision of that family does the Accadian belong?

Now it cannot but be observed that the analogies between the latter and the Basque are peculiarly numerous and striking. It is only in the most natural and necessary relations of grammar, more especially the prefixing of the pronouns in the verb, that the Accadian agrees with Taic or Malay: these languages are built upon the isolated word, while Accadian takes its start from the sentence. These natural relations of grammar again, however contrary to the general principle of modern Turanian speech, are to be found on the one side in Basque, on the other in Tungusic, while traces of them may be detected in Ugric. The postposition of the adjective, moreover, though now opposed to the practice of Turanian dialects, is but the earliest expression of Agglutinative grammar, and is still the

undeviating rule in Basque, and occasionally to be met with in Ugrian; while the postposition of the pronouns, a distinguishing feature of the Turanian, separates the Accadian from the non-Aryan languages of India. In the same way, though the Ural-Altaic languages, in common with the idioms of the Caucasus, and of India (which herein differ from the Malay and the Taic), place the genitive before the governing noun, yet, according to Wiedemann[1], the converse may be the case in Wotiak and is its normal position in Basque. On the other hand, postpositions, the radical characteristic of the Turanian dialects, hold a conspicuous place in Accadian, thus conclusively marking it off from preposition-using languages such as the Taic and the Malay. The machinery of the verb, furthermore, which forms its conjugations by root-words inserted between the verbal base and the pronouns, ranks the Accadian with the Turanian tongues, as well as its possession of a negative verb, and of its relative use of the participle. Its frequent employment of compounds, and its want of all gender in the pronouns, not only place it in the Turanian stock, but also contrast it with the Tamulic. But, above all, its chief characteristic, the incorporation of the pronouns, enables us with the most accuracy to assign this new language to its proper place. This phenomenon alone would raise a presumption of its belonging to the Iberian subclass. Added to the marks of affinity I have already enumerated, we shall not go far wrong in looking upon the Accadian as the oldest member of the Iberian stem. The near affinity of the Iberian to the Ugric has already been remarked; it cannot surprise us, therefore, if the Ugric also retains some vestiges of the incorporation of the pronouns. The Ugric, however, must have attained a high degree of development, probably in Elam to which the earliest parts of the Kalewala may look back, before the population which spoke it moved northward. And it is impossible to estimate what influence may have been exerted upon it by its neighbourhood to the Accadian. This may be one reason for the number of

[1] *Grammatik der Wotjakischen Sprache*, p. 270.

roots common to the two classes of language. I have hitherto said nothing upon this point, because in discussing the Turanian languages we have no clue to guide us in our comparisons of the vocabulary except mere resemblance and conjecture. There is as yet no Grimm's law whereby we may track a root through the various dialects. And not only is the vocabulary small, but nomade languages are continually changing. In "secluded dialects", says Prof. Max Müller[1], "the peculiarities of individuals may gain an influence which changes the whole surface of grammar and dictionary...If the work of agglutination has commenced, and there is nothing like literature or society to keep it within limits, two villages, separated only for a few generations, will become mutually unintelligible. This takes place in America, as well as on the borders of China and India; and in the north of Asia, Messerschmidt relates, that the Ostiakes, though really speaking the same language everywhere, have produced so many words and forms peculiar to each tribe, that even within the limits of twelve or twenty German miles, conversation between them becomes extremely difficult....The conversation of nomadic tribes moves within a narrow circle, and with the great facility of forming new words at random and the great inducement that a solitary life holds out to invent for the objects which form the world of a shepherd or huntsman, new appellations—half poetical, perhaps, or satirical,—we can understand how, after a few generations, the dictionary of a nomadic tribe may have gone, as it were, through more than one edition." Add to this, the constant migrations of small tribes, political changes which have swept over central Asia, the numerous loan-words that have been borrowed by tribes, ready enough to throw aside their old vocabulary, from the foreign races with which they are perpetually coming into contact, and we can only be surprised that so many similar radicals are still to be found in the several Turanian languages. When we attempt to compare the Accadian dictionary with those of modern dialects, the difficulties become greater. Not only is there the great interval of time, and the great interval

[1] In Bunsen's *Outlines of the Phil. of Univ. Hist.*, p. 483.

of space to be traversed from the Tungusians on the one side to the Basques on the other, but there is also the social difference, the influence of which upon language is inappreciably immense. With the speech of a people who were the pioneers of civilisation, who invented writing, and established a flourishing empire, we have to compare the idioms of scattered, barbarous, nomade hordes. Indeed I have been astonished at the number of words which seem to be like those of modern dialects. It is true that these denote the most ordinary objects, and that their modern analogues are to be generally found in the most highly developed dialects. A certain number such as *dingir*, *taq* seem to connect themselves with the Tataric branch: most of these, however, may also be detected in the Ugric idioms, and it is in these last that Accadian words seem chiefly to find their counterparts. The roots most likely to be preserved would be the postpositions and the numerals. Of the former I have already spoken, and their shortness may easily lead to deceptive resemblances, especially in languages which retain a full consciousness of the independent meaning of all grammatical particles, and therefore can replace them by others at pleasure. With regard to the latter, even Professor Schott allows the existence of more than one root for several of these numerals, and so little conservative are the Turanian languages even in these that the Basque has borrowed the name of "two" from its Aryan neighbours. Still, the only Accadian numerals of whose phonetic powers we are certain, are unmistakeably Ugrian (§ 6), as also are the pronouns, another lexical element likely to be preserved. Many of the commonest roots, moreover, with all due allowance for borrowing or chance likeness, are yet to be found in the Ugric dialects; several of these I have noted in the course of this paper, and others might be added such as *usar* "a bank", Fin. *syrjä*, Tcherem. *sir*, Elam. *esritu*, (? Wot. *zariz* "sea"). Some, no doubt, may be deceptive; nevertheless, a certain residuum is left, which may hereafter enable us to apply the laws of "lautverschiebung" to this group of languages. I have before noticed two at least of these laws, the replacement of an Accadian *l* by *t* in the Ugrian idioms, as well as the converse change, the dental, if initial, being liable to be dropped alto-

gether in Basque, besides the substitution of a labial for an initial guttural or the still more frequent loss of the latter altogether in the more modern dialects. A critical comparison of the Accadian and Basque dictionaries would doubtlessly yield valuable results; but it must be remembered, that, independently of the immense interval both of time and space between them, we have but a mere fragment of the Accadian vocabulary, while Basque has long since entered into the stage of phonetic decay and has filled more than one half its lexicon with borrowed words. The Accadian presents us with Iberian language still in its undisguised, primitive development, it carries us back to a period of agglutinative speech far more remote than its oldest record hitherto known to us, and it preserves all this in a native system of writing, sadly mutilated it is true, but still sufficiently serviceable to the comparative philologist. It may yet stand to Turanian philology much in the same place that the Rig-Veda stands to Aryan philology. I have endeavoured in the foregoing paper to lay the foundations of such results; I must leave it to those who are more qualified than myself to carry it out more fully.

A. H. SAYCE.

Queen's College, Oxford,
Feb. 4, 1870.

ON THE END OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

Dr Lightfoot in this Journal (ii 264 ff.) has demolished M. Renan's ingenious theory about the composition of the Epistle to the Romans, and along with it some others of inferior merit. He proposes instead a simpler view, which one could wish to believe true, so admirably does it harmonize the most salient phenomena of the text, and so free is it from broad historical improbability. A close examination however reveals difficulties which I am constrained to think fatal.

Dr Lightfoot supposes that the letter originally addressed to the Romans was our present epistle as it stands in the Received Text and Authorized Version, wanting only the last four verses, i.e. the second Benediction (xvi 24) and the Doxology (25—27); but that at a later time St Paul himself 'made it available as a circular letter or general treatise' by cutting off the last two chapters, substituting the Doxology, and omitting the name of Rome in i 7, 15. The direct evidence lies in three chapters, i xiv xvi, which I will consider separately and in inverse order.

I. The apparently triple ending of xvi in the Received Text, when taken as a whole, rests on absurdly small and worthless evidence, three or four obscure cursives and the inferior MSS of the Latin Vulgate: it is a mere jumble of the Latin and the late Greek traditions, which owes its place in the printed text to Erasmus[1]. If the Doxology be put out of

[1] His account of his own proceeding is intelligible, while his carelessness grossly misrepresents the evidence; indeed his statement is further from the truth as it could be known at that date than it would be now. "Hanc partem usque ad *Debemus autem* quidam codices omnino non habent, qui-

sight, we are met by a still worse confusion of incongruous traditions; that is, the doubling of the Benediction (20 and 24). The great mass of early authorities of various groups concur in placing the Benediction at 20 only: so ℵABC 5 137 lat.vg(best MSS) memph aeth Orig.ruf. The pure 'Western' group D*FG (with Sedulius and perhaps the Gothic version) places it only at 24[1], evidently from the feeling that it must be the close of the epistle. Minor shiftings and other like freedoms taken by the same group of authorities occur in almost every chapter of St Paul: two whole verses 1 Cor. xiv 34 f. are pushed 5 verses forward by DFG 93 and some Latin Fathers: compare 1 Cor. xv 26. The scribes of the fourth century, bringing together MSS from different regions, here as in countless other instances heaped up without omission whatever they found, and so the Benediction was set down in both places. The compound reading appears first in the Greek commentators of the fifth century from the Syrian school, then in the Harclean Syriac (A.D. 508—616): in extant MSS it is found only in L (= J) of the ninth century and the great mass of cursives. There is however a similar combination in a few respectable authorities who retain the Doxology and place the second Benediction after it (P 17, the vulgar Syriac and the Armenian versions, and the Ambrosian Hilary): and this implies the previous existence of MSS which simply transposed the Benediction to *their* end of the epistle, as (D*)FG transposed it to *theirs*[2]. Thus the historical

dam in fine adjiciunt epistolæ. Nos, quoniam id non videbatur ad hunc locum pertinere, semovimus in finem hujus epistolæ" (note on xiv 23 in ed. princeps of 1516). "Hæc est pars quæ in plerisque Græcorum codicibus non additur, in nonnullis alio additur loco, sicut indicavimus, in quibusdam adjicitur in fine. Id quod et nos fecimus, præsertim assentientibus Latinis exemplaribus" (note on xvi 25 ff.).

[1] D* and Sedulius add the Doxology after the Benediction. The nature of both authorities, as evinced by their readings generally, explains this singular collocation. D is not so purely Western as FG: Sedulius combines the Old with the Hieronymic Latin. In each case the Doxology must be a later accretion. The Gothic has the Benediction at 24 and (in xvi) no Doxology: the extant fragments fail to shew whether the Benediction was at 20 likewise.

[2] If, as is probable, the shifting of the Benediction and the dropping of the Doxology were simultaneous in the common source of D*FG Sed., P 17 &c.

relations of the authorities clearly shew that, be the claims of the double Benediction as a 'harder reading' what they may, it is as a matter of fact the last term in a series of changes.

Thus far there is no reason to suppose that Dr Lightfoot would dissent. He places the Benediction at 20 and there alone, and gives what is doubtless the right explanation of the order in saying that "v. 20 is the true close of the epistle, and the salutations from the amanuensis and other companions of St Paul were added irregularly as a sort of postscript, as was very likely to have been done, considering the circumstances under which St Paul's epistles were written" (p. 295). Whoever will read the chapter through as far as 24 according to this arrangement, will find everything straightforward and intelligible; while the nature of the postscript is such as might easily mislead a mechanical transcriber. The difficulty begins when we go on to 25—27. Supposing however that we had no evidence about these three verses except as to their presence or absence *in this place*[1], I do not see why we need hesitate to take them as an ending to the postscript, just as 20 is the ending to the epistle proper[2]. Having once made that fresh start to introduce the salutations sent by present companions, St Paul might gladly seize the opportunity to close the whole by a solemn giving of glory to God, as his first ending had carried grace to men. Compare xi 36 in connexion with xi 32 and the adjoining verses; also v 2; xv 5, 6. Similar pauses of adoration occur elsewhere in the epistle; i 25; (viii 39;) ix 5; xi 36; xv (13,) 33, where I believe Ἀμήν to be genuine: and it is to be observed that, when St Paul's own salutations to Christians at Rome were ended, he was not able to refrain (xvi 17—20) from breaking out afresh into renewed exhortations to

differ merely in taking one step instead of two: the writer of their common original was willing to transpose but not to omit. The two transpositions were however apparently independent of each other.

[1] Their total omission will be considered further on.

[2] The postscript is evidently St Paul's own, notwithstanding the first person used for the moment in 22 by Tertius the amanuensis in sending his own greeting. Otherwise ὁ συνεργός [μου], οἱ συγγενεῖς μου *before* the mention of Tertius would not be intelligible. The subsequent ὁ ξένος μου καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας is also the language of an apostle.

mutual peace through willing obedience to the common Lord. As he had gone back to the perils and hopes of the Church after the one set of individual greetings, so we can imagine him joyfully returning to the yet higher sphere of God's universal purposes after the other set of individual greetings[1]. Nay the parallelism between 17—20 and 25—27 is one of contrast as well as likeness. The first passage gives vent to somewhat of the anxious dread which lurks behind many a phrase of xv 14—33, especially 30, 31. If these were St Paul's last words to the Romans except the two sets of greetings and the Benediction of 20 b, the epistle might have appeared to end in a note of discord: at all events its exulting comprehensiveness would have died back into the rebuke and controversy proper for the Galatians. The sudden upward flight of the Doxology seems therefore to be almost demanded, to swallow up not only trivial individualities of salutation but also the temporary strifes of the Church.

But it is said that the Doxology differs too much in style from the rest of the epistle to form part of it. I used to suspect that it might be the ending to one of the forms of the encyclical epistle to the Ephesians, which was preserved from being lost to the Canon by being appended to St Paul's longest epistle. Dr Lightfoot (after Dean Alford) points out its resemblance to the Pastoral Epistles as well, and accordingly treats it as marked by the Apostle's later style generally. Before scrutinizing words and phrases, let us look at the subject. The starting-point is doubly personal; an anxiety about the stability of the converts addressed, such as tinges the hopefulness of the first and last words spoken to and about the Romans (i 11; xvi 17—20); and a bold lifting up of what friend and foe knew as the distinctive 'Gospel' of St Paul, (and that in its distinctive form of 'preaching', and with its distinctive appeal to 'faith',) such as marks the time of the conflict with Judaism within the Church (i 1, 5, 9, 16; xv 16; x 8, 14, 15). Here

[1] Dr Lightfoot says (p. 292) that the Doxology "has nothing in common with the usual endings of St Paul's Epistles, which close with a benediction of the type" ἡ χάρις κ.τ.λ. But none of his other epistles have a postscript, following a benediction in that form already given.

the pronouns 'you' and 'my' face each other with an emphasis which in such a context is hard to explain till we remember the presaging instinct with which St Paul saw in the meeting of himself and the Roman Christians, if indeed it was to be vouchsafed, the pledge and turning-point of victory (i 10 ff.; xv 29—32; cf. Acts xix 21; xxviii 31). Then comes the idea in which the Doxology culminates, the counsel of the far-seeing God, the Ruler of ages or periods, by which the mystery kept secret from ancient times is laid open in the Gospel for the knowledge and faith of all nations. This idea no doubt pervades the Epistle to the Ephesians, though with considerable enrichments. But is it foreign to St Paul's earlier thought? The second chapter of 1 Corinthians at once shews that it was not and explains why the fact is not obvious. St Paul is dealing there with converts who were in danger from pride of eloquence and wisdom (from i 5 onward). For fear of this danger, he says (ii 1 ff.), he himself kept back all excellency of speech or of wisdom when he came among them, and confined himself to the bare preaching of the Cross as alone fitted to their imperfect state. But for all that he desired them to know that he too had in reserve a wisdom which he spoke among the perfect. Its nature he briefly hints in words that closely resemble our Doxology ("We speak a wisdom of God in a mystery, that hidden wisdom which God fore-ordained before the ages unto the glory of us" &c. ii 7), and then hastens to explain that, even after being laid open, it demands a spiritual power to discern it. The Churches to which he wrote about this time, at Corinth, in Galatia, at Rome, were not in a state to profit by an extended exposition of a belief which yet was strong in the Apostle's own mind, and so the traces of it in the early period are few. Later it filled a larger space in his thoughts, it acquired new extensions and associations, and he had occasion to write to Churches which by that time were capable of receiving it. But it is not really absent even from the Epistle to the Romans. Kindred thoughts find broken and obscure utterance in viii 18—30. The belief itself is the hidden foundation of the three chapters (ix—xi) in which God's dealings with Jew and Gentile are expounded, and comes per-

ceptibly to light in their conclusion (xi 33—36). Now it is precisely in these chapters, as F. C. Baur (*Paulus* 341 ff.) saw long ago, that the main drift of the epistle is most distinctly disclosed: all its various antitheses are so many subordinate aspects of the relation of Jew and Gentile which in this seeming episode is contemplated in its utmost generality as reaching from the one end of history to the other. The whole epistle could hardly have a fitter close than a Doxology embodying the faith from which its central chapters proceed. Here at last that faith might well be articulately expressed, though a wise economy compelled it to be latent as long as the Apostle was simply instructing the Romans. This Doxology is in fact a connecting link between the epistle at large and the earlier concentrated doxology of xi 36. In both alike human sin and hindrance are triumphantly put out of sight[1]: but here the eternal operation of Him 'from Whom, through Whom, and unto Whom are all things' is translated into the language of history.

An examination of single phrases is attempted in the following table, which includes some less obvious coincidences of thought[2].

Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι	Rom. xiv 4...*στήκει ἢ πίπτει· σταθήσεται δὲ, δυνατεῖ γὰρ ὁ κύριος στῆσαι αὐτόν.* *Δύναμαι, δυνατός, δυνατέω* with an infinitive are used of God Rom. iv 21; xi 23; 2 Cor. ix 8; (xiii 3;) Gal. iii 21; [2 Tim. i 12: *τῷ...δυναμένῳ*...Eph. iii 20.] *Στηρίζω* in St Paul is found elsewhere only Rom. i 11 (*ἐπιποθῶ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς...εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς*) and 4 times in 1, 2 Thess. 'Standing fast' is a common phrase in 1, 2 Thess., 1, 2 Cor., Gal., Rom.; though also found later: "falling" is confined to 1 Cor., Rom.
κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου	So Rom. ii 16; [2 Tim. ii 8.] So also *κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* Rom. xi 28, for here as there the inclusion of the Gentiles must be chiefly meant. (The 'stablishment' of the Romans would presuppose the harmony of Jew and Gentile among them.) In this light *μου* is illustrated by i 1—6, 9, 16; xv 16.

[1] They could not be left out in the latter part of the Epistle, when St Paul's own position and the dangers of the Romans had to be spoken of (xv 14—33; xvi 17–20). But for this very reason it was the more necessary that the ground conquered at the end of xi should be maintained at the final close of the Epistle. See p. 54.

[2] References to the later epistles are in []: the chief passages are set out at length by Dr Lightfoot, p. 293.

καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

Compare Rom. ii 16; x 8—12; xv 5 f.; 1 Cor. i 21; xii 12 f.; 2 Cor. i 19 f.; Gal. iii 26—29; [2 Tim. iv 17; Tit. i 3: also 1 Tim. ii 7; 2 Tim. i 11.] The double name appears to have special force in this connexion.

κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν

Rom. i 16 f.…*εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε* [*πρῶτον*] *καὶ Ἕλληνι· δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ* [sc. *τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*] *ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν*: here the historical *δικαιοσύνη* is a part of the *μυστήριον*: and so iii 21 *νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως* [Ἰησοῦ] *Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας*: cf. Gal. iii 22 f. Rom. xi 25…*τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο…ὅτι πώρωσις ἀπὸ μέρους τῷ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν ἄχρι οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ, καὶ οὕτως πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται.* 1 Cor. ii 6, 7, 10 *σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις…θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην, ἣν προώρισεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων…· ἡμῖν γὰρ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος.* [Eph. iii 3—11. *Πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων* 2 Tim. i 9; Tit. i 2.]

διά τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν

Rom. i 2…*εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ ὃ προεπηγγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις*; iii 21 (above); and ix—xi *passim*.

κατ' ἐπιταγὴν

[1 Tim. i 1; Tit. i 3.] But the meaning is given by Rom. i 1, 5 *δι' οὗ* [sc. Ἰ. Χ.] *ἐλάβομεν…ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*; x 15; and the mere formula *κατ' ἐπιταγήν* 1 Cor. vii 6; 2 Cor. viii 8.

τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ

1 Cor. ii 7 (above); x 11; cf. Rom. xi 33—36. [1 Tim. i 17 *τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων*: also Eph. iii 9, 11; Col. i 26; 2 Tim. i 9; Tit. i 2.]

εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως

Verbatim in this connexion Rom. i 5 (above). This enlarged sense of *ὑπακοή, ὑπακούω*, is confined to the early epistles (Rom. vi 17; x 16; xv 18 *εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἐθνῶν*; ? xvi 19; 2 Thess. i 8; 2 Cor. vii 15; ? x 5 f.)

εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος,

Rom. i 5 above; xi *passim;* xv *passim;* xvi 3 f. *Γνωρίζω* is *similarly* used Rom. ix 22 f.; 1 Cor. xv 1; ? Gal. i 11; as well as (often) in the later period.

μόνῳ σόφῳ θεῷ

Rom. iii 29, 30 *ἢ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεὸς μόνων; οὐχὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν; ναὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν, εἴπερ εἷς ὁ θεὸς ὅς κ.τ.λ.* [*Μόνῳ θεῷ* 1 Tim. i 17, a kindred passage, which early caused *τῶν αἰώνων* to be inserted here after *τοὺς αἰῶνας*, and in its turn received *σόφῳ* hence in the fourth century: cf. 1 Tim. vi 15; but also Jud. 4, 25; John v 44 &c.] *Σοφία* is predicated of God by St Paul with reference to the working out of a distant purpose by unexpected means: so Rom. xi 33; 1 Cor. i 21, ? 30; ii 7; [Eph. i 8; iii 10; Col. ii 3.]

διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [*ᾧ*][1] *ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν.*

Rom. v. 1 f.; xv 6 f.; Gal. i 4 f.; [Eph. i 5 f., 11—14; iii 21; Col. i 27; 1 Tim. i 11, 17.]

[1] *ᾧ* is probably an intrusion, notwithstanding the presumption in favour of an irregular construction.

A minute examination of the passages briefly indicated in this table will shew that the dominant thoughts of the Epistle, —the thoughts which inspired its beginning (i 1—17), its primary close (xv 6—33), and its three characteristic chapters in which the old faith and revelation are invoked on behalf of the new,—are precisely those expressed in the final Doxology; and that the separate words and phrases of the Doxology are for the most part what have already occurred in the Epistle, while there are hardly any not to be found in epistles of the same or an earlier period[1]. If this be so, the obvious resemblances to parts of the later epistles lose all force as evidence of date. The Doxology and 1 Cor. ii 6—10, a passage absolutely inseparable from its context, support each other in shewing that St Paul's late teaching was his early belief; while in each case there was an adequate motive for his exceptional transgression of the limits imposed on him by the present imperfection of his converts. The condensed and cumulative style, which he used more freely afterwards, arises naturally from the compression of varied thoughts and facts into a single idea in a single sentence under the impulse of eager feeling. Rom. i 1—7; iii 21—26; 2 Thess. i 3—10 offer a true analogy: what distinguishes them is their articulation, which was hardly possible in a doxology. But we may go further. As is the Epistle to the Romans itself in relation to the monuments of St Paul's early teaching, gathering up, harmonizing, concluding, such is the Doxology in relation to the Epistle. It looks at once backwards and forwards. Springing from the keen sense of a present crisis, it gives old watchwords of action a place in the dawning vision of thought which the epistles from Rome were to expound, and anticipates in its style as in its ideas the habitual mood of the time when the crisis was victoriously ended, and the unity of the Church secured.

II. The course thus far has been smooth, because the chief textual difficulties have been out of sight. The end of

[1] The only clear exception is *χρόνοι αἰώνιοι* (2 Tim. i 9; Tit. i 2), the idea of which is preserved in 1 Cor. ii 7; x 11. On the other hand *ὑπακοὴ (πίστεως)*, both phrase and sense, is peculiar to the early epistles.

the fourteenth chapter is a point at which various phenomena present themselves which nothing in the context would have led us to expect. Some of them (*a*) on the surface mark only an interruption of the Epistle. The Doxology is inserted either (1) here alone or (2) both here and in xvi. In (3) a single MS G, one of the twin MSS which alone omit the Doxology altogether, an empty space is left here, occupying half a line at the bottom of an otherwise full page and 5 lines of the next page. Secondly (*β*) the whole of the two following chapters are supposed to have been omitted (1) by Marcion (on the authority of Origen), (2) perhaps by Tertullian and even Irenæus, and (3) in the capitulation of an unknown Latin MS mentioned by Wetstein. The variety of this evidence, if it stands proof, is a strong argument in favour of any theory which will account for all the particulars.

The testimony of Origen requires consideration first. We have it only in the greatly abridged version of Rufinus, a careless and licentious translator. This is not a passage with which he is likely to have consciously tampered; but there is no certainty that the language is Origen's own. Characteristic terms of expression as well as ideas may be recognized through Rufinus's Latin in almost every page; but none such are conspicuous here: rather the sentences are short and simple for Origen. The comment on the Doxology (after xvi 23) begins thus. "Caput hoc Marcion, a quo Scripturae Evangelicae atque Apostolicae interpolatae sunt de hac epistola penitus abstulit: et non solum *hoc*, sed et *ab* eo loco ubi scriptum est 'Omne autem quod non ex fide peccatum est' [xiv 23] usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit. In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est in his quae non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput diverse positum invenimus. In nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum quem supra diximus, statim cohaerens habetur 'Ei autem qui potens est vos confirmare.' Alii vero codices in fine id ut hunc est positum continent. Sed jam veniamus ad capituli ipsius explanationem." As the text stands, it asserts plainly that Marcion removed from the Epistle both the Doxology and xv xvi; and that of the MSS unaffected by Marcion's proceeding some had the Doxology after xiv, some after xvi.

So the passage has been universally understood. On the other hand for many years I have had a strong impression that the Benedictine text is wrong in three letters, and that on the removal of this tiny corruption the whole interpretation collapses. De la Rue's notes on this book often mention the readings of a certain Paris MS (Reg. 1639). Wherever I have examined them, they have appeared usually to give the truest text against all other known authorities, and very seldom to be evidently wrong. In this place Reg. 1639 has *in* instead of *ab*. If the preceding *hoc* is likewise altered to *hic*, and so small a variation may easily have escaped notice, we get an entirely new and, I venture to think, more probable statement. Origen begins by saying merely that "Marcion, the falsifier[1] of the Gospels and [St Paul's] Epistles, removed this paragraph completely from the Epistle." Then it appears to strike him that some reader might know the Epistle in a copy which had the Doxology at the end of xiv (if not there alone), and acquit Marcion as having at most only removed a superfluous repetition[2]. He adds therefore explicitly "And not only here but also" at xiv 23 "he cut away[3] everything quite to the end." Then, for fear the remark might not be understood by those who knew the Doxology only in xvi, he explains

[1] *Interpolo* in ancient Latin, it will be remembered, does not mean to interpolate, but properly to give a spurious look of newness to old things, and so generally to falsify.

[2] Reasons will be given further on for suspecting that the MSS here noticed by Origen had the Doxology in *both* places. At this point the difference is without importance.

[3] This is not, it must be confessed, the natural meaning of the single word *dissecuit:* but will the context on any view tolerate another? As regards the Doxology, *abstulit* is decisive. Is it conceivable that Marcion only '*separated*' xv xvi from the rest of the Epistle, while still acknowledging their authority, whether he joined them to another epistle or not? or that such an operation would be unrecorded? The difficulty surely lies in the translation. *Dissecuit* would not be an unnatural rendering of περιέκοψεν or possibly περιέτεμεν, either of which would mean simply 'cut away.' Compare Epiph. *Haer.* 309 D οὐ μόνον δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπέτεμεν [of St Luke's Gospel]..., ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ τέλους καὶ τῶν μέσων πολλὰ περιέκοψε τῶν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγων κ.τ.λ.: and again ἀλλά τινα αὐτῶν περιτέμνων, τινὰ δὲ ἀλλοιώσας κεφάλαια. In the first sentence, so closely resembling Rufinus's in form, ἀποτέμνω and περικόπτω must be practically synonymous, for the preceding sentence describes the Gospel as περικεκομμένον ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς by Marcion.

"But in other copies, that is in those which have not been corrupted by Marcion, we have found this very paragraph differently placed" &c.

Of these three statements the end of the second might be thought a mere repetition of the first, according to the corrected reading. But I think Origen wished to make it perfectly clear that Marcion's offence, as he understood it, was no mere erasure of an obnoxious phrase but utter excision of the entire paragraph. Nor is it unlikely that the Greek original contained intermediate digressive sentences which gave a resumptive force to the repetition. No one, I presume, would seriously find a difficulty in the words "to the end" as inappropriate to the removal of the Doxology alone, in the case of MSS in which it had stood at xiv 23: their correctness in reference to its normal position would make them sufficiently descriptive for Origen's purpose. *Hoc ipsum caput* is perhaps a slightly stronger phrase than we might have expected: how far it represents the Greek, and, if supposed exact, how far a knowledge of the unabridged context would explain it, we need not try to conjecture: even as it stands, it has a certain force in binding together the first and second statements.

On the other hand the internal evidence for the truth of the corrected reading is substantial. The order of the sentences, which Rufinus is not likely to have changed, runs naturally upon this view. By the common reading Origen keeps till last the only fact specially concerning the passage on which he is commenting: his first two sentences might have been written with equal force and appropriateness on any group of verses in the two chapters. He begins with saying that Marcion removed this paragraph, three verses, and then condemns, as an aggravation of the main offence, his removal of 59 verses, of which these three are nothing more than the end. Why should he choose this particular place for the remark, if Marcion's operation was really on that extensive scale? Why not mention it at the proper place, xiv 23? It may be urged that possibly he was forgetful there, as he is certainly silent about the Doxology, but gladly repaired his omission when the Doxology brought to mind by association the earlier critical

point in the Epistle. Certainly it might be so. But in that case we should expect him to begin with the transposition of his immediate text, and having so been carried to xiv 23 to append by way of digression an account of Marcion's proceeding. The reverse order, which we actually find, has no logical justification on the common interpretation, unless Origen himself saw in Marcion's supposed omission of xv xvi and in the transposition of the Doxology two facts connected by community of origin. That however is a step in criticism which there is not the slightest evidence that he took. He regarded Marcion's omission, whatever its extent, as an original and unprecedented act; and he gives no hint that the transposition or repetition in certain MSS was a consequence of Marcion's mutilation: in other words the two facts were in his eyes two independent phenomena. How then came the one to suggest the other? If Marcion omitted two chapters, the sole point of contact is xiv 23; and thus the transposition, which alone forms a bridge from xvi 24 to xiv 23, must have preceded the omission in Origen's account. If on the other hand Marcion cut out only what the scribes transposed, then no bridge is needed. The first and the last sentences refer alike to the same subject, the paragraph on which Origen is avowedly about to comment. The second sentence refers partly to this place, partly to the other; and likewise serves to anticipate an erroneous criticism of the first statement, which might occur to Origen's readers.

The commentary of Jerome on Eph. iii 5 explains diffusely how St Paul could say that 'the mystery of Christ in other generations was not made known to the sons of men' notwithstanding the language of the Prophets. At the outset he repudiates the doctrine *juxta Montanum* that the prophets spoke in ecstasy, not knowing what they said. Three columns further on he repeats "Those who will have it that the prophets understood not what they said, and spoke as it were in ecstasy, bring to confirm their doctrine not only the present text, but also that which is found [in the epistle] to the Romans in most MSS, reading *Now to Him, &c.*" The inference is obvious, that the writer had seen or heard of MSS which did *not* contain the Doxology. But who is the writer? Jerome in his preface

tells us that he had partly followed the three books of Origen on this Epistle. Comparison of the Greek fragments proves how freely he drew on his great predecessor's ample stores; and any one familiar with Origen's style will recognize it in many places where the Greek is entirely lost. Throughout this long disquisition Origen's hand cannot be mistaken, though Jerome may have added or altered this or that sentence. The controversy with Montanistic doctrine belongs moreover to the third, not the fourth century[1]. The character of the MSS hinted at as wanting the Doxology is sufficiently indicated in the two sentences which follow the refutation of the Montanists. "And in like manner it is to be observed that the mystery of our faith cannot be revealed except through the Prophetic Scriptures and the coming of Christ. Let those therefore know who understand not the Prophets, and desire not to know, protesting that they are content with the Gospel alone" &c. This evident allusion to the Marcionists, the other great sect which threatened the Church in Origen's days, suggests the strong probability that the passages from his two commentaries relate to the same subject. What he calls "most MSS" here are identical with "those copies which have not been corrupted by Marcion." In the former case the Doxology is said to have been omitted[2]: may we not infer, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that this and this alone constituted Marcion's offence? Whatever the argument might be worth taken independently, it appears to me a striking corroboration of the result obtained thus far.

Tertullian's language is ambiguous. After confuting Marcion out of Galatians and 1, 2 Corinthians, he proceeds to Romans (*adv. Marc.* v 13). Henceforth, he says, he will touch but briefly on what has come before him already, and pass over

[1] The dislike of the early Alexandrians to the Montanist theory of 'prophecy' or inspiration is well known.

[2] The words are "Qui volunt Prophetas &c., cum praesenti testimonio illud quoque quod ad Romanos in plerisque codicibus invenitur ad confirmationem sui dogmatis trahunt, legentes *Ei autem*" &c. They do not formally negative the omission of the two whole chapters; but other language would surely have been chosen had the Doxology been the mere conclusion of a large section omitted.

altogether what has come before him frequently. He is tired of arguing about the Law, and about God as a Judge, and so an Avenger, and so a Creator. Yet he must point out the plain references to justice and judgement which meet him at the beginning of the Epistle (i 16 ff.; ii 2). It will be enough for him, he declares, to prove his point from Marcion's negligences and blindnesses, from the sayings which he left undisturbed[1]. He then runs over the Epistle in 5 pages, just half what he had bestowed on the little epistle to the Galatians, passing over in silence some long spaces of text containing appropriate matter, as iii 1—20 and x 5—xi 32. The ethical paragraph xii 9—xiii 10 tempts him to give examples of the anticipation of its teaching in the Old Testament, and he concludes with insisting on the harmony of Law and Gospel in inculcating love of neighbours. There apparently he intended to stop, the doctrinal part of the Epistle being ended, but his eye was caught by the words "judgement-seat of Christ" at xiv 10. He therefore adds (14 s. f.) rather awkwardly, with evident reference to what he had said on the beginning of the Epistle[2], "Bene autem quod *et in clausula* tribunal Christi[3] comminatur, utique *judicis et ultoris*, utique *creatoris*, illum certe constituens promerendum quem intentat timendum, etiamsi alium praedicaret." And then he proceeds to another epistle. The absence of allusions to anything in xv xvi requires no explanation: it is hard to see what could have been cited except xv 4, 8, 18, which are slight

[1] He notices but one omission by Marcion in this epistle, that of c. ix. The limits are not given, but there is little room for doubt. Eight other (short) omissions are recorded by Epiphanius, who professes to furnish only a selection (*Haer.* 317 f.). It is singular that Epiphanius should pass over the loss of three consecutive verses: but his silence would be far more astounding if two whole chapters were missing. Nothing could be safely inferred in any case from his employment of the word *ἀκρωτηριάζω* as applied to St Paul's epistles (*καὶ αὐτῶν δὲ ἠκρωτηριασμένων συνήθως τῇ αὐτοῦ ῥᾳδιουργίᾳ* 317 D): his wide use of it is manifest when he says (311 D) that the Gospel, as *ἠκρωτηρίασται μήτε ἀρχὴν ἔχον μήτε μέσα μήτε τέλος, ἱματίου βεβρωμένου ὑπὸ πολλῶν σητῶν ἐπέχει τὸν τρόπον.*

[2] So not long before he had said, not it is not true of a book but of a passage (1 Cor. ix 10—x 11), "Denique et in clausula praefationi [apostolus] respondet" (c. 7).

[3] The true reading is *τοῦ θεοῦ*, but confusion with 2 Cor. v 10 was easy.

and contain nothing new in relation to Marcion, and the Doxology, which all agree to have been omitted by him. But *in clausula* certainly means "in the close of the Epistle," and it is a natural inference that such a phrase would not have been used if xv xvi had stood in Tertullian's MS, whether that was his own or one of Marcion's recension. Natural but not conclusive. The verse quoted is not in the actual close on any view; thirteen verses follow of xiv. But the force of the word must be estimated by the context. Antithesis to the beginning of the Epistle, not by any means the very beginning but i 16 ff., ii 2, is the motive of the remark. If xiv 10 is included in a section of the Epistle, however large, which can fairly be called in any sense its close, the point of the remark is saved. Now Tertullian had to all appearance virtually ended his comments at xiii 10. What follows to the end, with the partial exception of xv 3 f., 8—12, is either hortatory or personal. The business of the Epistle, so to speak, is over: to the eye of a rhetorician, accustomed to study the members of a speech, the remainder would all constitute the close. Tertullian uses the word more loosely still on another occasion, again for the sake of an antithesis. To reinforce his position that Christ's command to flee from city to city under persecution became obsolete when the apostles went forth to convert the Gentiles, he urges that St Paul, who at an early time had consented to escape in a basket, in the close of his ministry (*in clausula officii*) rebuked those who urged him not to go up to Jerusalem lest he should suffer there (*de Fuga in Pers.* 6). Yet this incident (Acts xxi 13) preceded the events at Jerusalem, the two years' imprisonment at Cæsarea, the voyage and shipwreck, and the two years at Rome; to say nothing of later occurrences not told in the Acts.

It remains true that Tertullian does not cite any words out of xv xvi in other parts of his writings[1]: nor does Irenæus or perhaps Cyprian[2]. Negative facts of this kind are by no means

[1] Semler and Oehler indicate 5 references to xv 4, 14; xvi 18: but they are imaginary.

[2] Fell's index gives only xvi 18 'ventri serviunt: E[pist.] 233.' Doubtless he means p. 283 (*Ep.* 65 § 3) 'nec ante se religioni sed *ventri* potius et quaestui profana cupiditate *servisse*'; a very doubtful reference.

to be contemned, but their value depends on the attendant circumstances. Seventeen verses only of the two chapters (xv 1—13; xvi 17—20) were likely to be quoted. Of these Origen once quotes one (setting aside the commentary), Clement three; while of others it so happens that Origen quotes five, Clement three, besides the Doxology.

Lastly Wetstein has a note at the end of xiv: "Codex Latinus habet Capitula Epistolae ad Romanos 51, desinit autem in Caput XIV; ex quo conficitur ista Capitula ad Editionem Marcionis fuisse accommodata." "Later critics," says Dr Lightfoot, "have not been able to identify the MS and thus to verify the statement." Their failure however matters little. The phenomenon here obscurely described is not peculiar to a single MS: it belongs to what was probably a widely current Latin capitulation, found e.g. in the earliest (540—550) MSS of the Vulgate, the Amiatinus and the Fuldensis. The sections or *breves* of Romans are 51, § 50 beginning at xiv 15, and § 51 at xv 4. In the table of contents before the Epistle § 50 is headed "De periculo contristante [sic] fratrem suum esca sua, et quod non sit regnum Dei esca et potus sed justitia et pax et gaudium in Spiritu Sancto," a fair description of the section; and § 51 "De mysterio Domini ante passionem in silentio habito post passionem vero ipsius revelato," which in strictness applies only to the Doxology[1]. If the marginal figures were lost, it would be a natural inference that § 50 ended with xiv, that § 51 consisted of the Doxology, and that xv xvi were absent from the MS on which the capitulation was originally formed. But as on this view the table and the marginal figures contradict each other, it seems hopeless to attempt to clear up the confusion while the origin of the capitulation remains unknown[2]. There is no Latin authority whatever for associating

[1] Either Wetstein examined only the table of headings, or he overlooked the inconspicuous figures li at xv 4, a place where he would scarcely expect them. This is the sole point of difference.

[2] Internal evidence proves that the sections cannot, in their present form, answer to ecclesiastical lessons. Otherwise one might have thought that the Doxology was appended to xv 13 or 33 for public reading, and the rest of xv xvi neglected. Some sections are described only by their end, as others only by their beginning.

the Doxology with xiv 23; so that it would be rash to assume the table of headings to be alone authentic, and the marginal figures to have been inserted at xv 4 by a misunderstanding. Yet that is certainly a possible solution. Only it must be remembered that the table of headings, with all its obscurities, would stand as the sole direct piece of evidence for the omission of xv xvi by any authority.

One indirect testimony Dr Lightfoot finds in the space left after xiv 23 in the single MS G, as noticed above (p. 59). His inference is that "the copyist of an earlier MS, from which it has descended, transcribed a MS of the abridged recension [i.e. wanting xv xvi] till the end of chapter xiv, and then took up a MS of the original Epistle to the Romans to supply the lacking matter, omitting however the doxology as inappropriate to what had thus become the middle of the letter, and perhaps intending to give it a place afterwards, but abandoning his purpose. It is an instructive fact that in the allied MS F no space is left after ch. xiv, but the text is written continuously." "Either their common prototype[1], or a still earlier MS from which it

[1] The above was written on the assumption that F and G were independently copied from the archetype, as all considerable writers on the subject except Wetstein had laid down on apparently sufficient grounds. A query by Dr Westcott has recently induced me to examine the matter anew, and so led me to the conclusion that the scribe of G alone used the archetype, and that F is a copy of G. The few verbal (not orthographical) variations of F that might have seemed to preserve the readings of the archetype crumble away on examination. F often interchanges ὑμεῖς with ἡμεῖς, not seldom against all sense, and 6 times alters ὑπό to ἀπό: it omits the article 23 times, and perhaps once inserts it: it omits other words 16 times, and inserts them at most thrice (Rom. vii 19 μεισῶ as in 15; ix 31, with a special mark, δικαιοσύνης as in the line above; Gal. *fin.* ἀμήν; all from the Vulgate): and the remaining changes, I believe fourteen, of which most are favoured by the Vulgate, are all trivial and natural. On the other hand FG agree in countless blunders, evidently such and not traditional variants, which cannot all, to say the least, be set down to the archetype. Again the confusion of spellings has its uniformities. To take only the more frequent cases, F incessantly interchanges ε η, ο ω, ι υ, δ θ (τ); in almost every line FG *together* interchange ι ει, ε αι, very rarely either MS separately; and I have failed to detect any permutations approximately peculiar to G. Misspellings of the promiscuous sort swarm in FG together and in F separately; in G separately they are rare and always so simple as to be within the capacity of the scribe of F to correct. Precisely the same may be said of the divisions of words;

was copied, must have preserved the abridged recension." In other words (1) the scribe of G copied i—xiv from one MS and xv xvi from another; and (2) the scribe of F copied in like manner from the same *two MSS*, though he left no mark of the transition from the one to the other. If the first of these hypothetical facts were true, we ought surely to find some evidence of it in the respective texts; whereas the closest study fails to detect a shadow of difference in the character of the readings before and after the blank space. The partial adherence of D ex-

F is free from no outrageous portent found in G, but has to answer for many of its own. No one can believe that two scribes independently arrived at *e.g.* Ποτυπουσιν εχαι ὑγεισεμνον των λογων (both FG have ω over -νον: F further divides ὑγεισ. εμνον) for ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαινόντων λόγων: and the absence of division of words in the archetype is proved by the numerous self-corrections of the scribe of G, where he has added to the end of one word the first letters of the next, seen his error, and begun the second word afresh with a space between. In these cases he sometimes has forgotten to put in the cancelling dots or line, and then the writer of F confidingly transcribes the whole. But usually he is careful to follow only corrected readings. In 1 Cor. xi 31 f. ἀπό translated by *a* happens to be under the end of ἑαυτούς in G; and the stroke or accent which, as usual in G, caps *a* looks like a cancelling line to the final ς: hence F reads ἑαυτόν though the verb is διεκρίνομεν. Other instances might be given of the dependence of F on accidents in G. The relations of the Latin accompaniments (fg) are complicated, but tend to the same result. The body, so to speak, of g must have at least a double origin, from a pure Old Latin text and from one or more altered texts, either the true Vulgate or one of the intermediate revised texts or both. Where none of his materials represented the Greek literally enough, the scribe evidently devised new renderings of words and still oftener changed their order. This is shown not only negatively by comparison with the mixed and fragmentary yet frequently copious evidence of all sorts as to variations in Latin MSS and Fathers, but also positively by mistakes arising from the wrongly divided Greek words and the like. Sometimes g offers two or more alternative renderings, either all traditional or part traditional part original. The body of f is tolerably pure Vulgate, unequally but always imperfectly assimilated to the Greek with, I believe, the aid of no document except g, all the elements of which may be recognized. In 1 Cor. x, singled out by Mr Scrivener for its frequent departure from the Vulgate, out of the 46 variants 23 agree with d and 42 with g, while the remaining 4 consist of 2 blunders, one correction of an obvious blunder, and one interpretative change of tense. The concordance of evidence so various seems decisive against any claim of F to represent the archetype where it differs from G. Nothing however in the text of this article is substantially affected by the result except the sentences in brackets.

cepted, this character is unique among existing Greek MSS: that it should prevail equally in two MSS accessible to the scribe of G is possible certainly, but not likely; and the hypothesis involves this further anomaly that the two originals, so singularly like in the main, must have differed on the capital point, the omission of xv xvi. [When F is taken into account, fresh embarrassments arise. Either the scribe of F copied one MS throughout or he did not. If he did not, an exact repetition of the circumstances attending the writing of G is demanded, without such evidence as the blank is said to afford. If he did, what becomes of the primary original of G?] The blank may, I believe, be easily explained by a simple process. The Greek text of F and G alike was copied from a single archetype wanting only the Doxology. [The scribe of F wrote down exactly what lay before him.] The scribe of G on arriving at xiv 23 remembered the Doxology as occurring there in some other MS that he had read (all extant MSS but 9 have it there, 4 older, 5 younger), held faithfully to his archetype, but satisfied his conscience by leaving a space which might be filled up hereafter if needful. He did in fact only what the scribe of B had done four centuries before, when he left a blank column for the supplement to St Mark's Gospel (xvi 9—20). It follows that FG attest the omission of the Doxology alone, while the blank in G vouches merely for the vulgar Greek text as it prevailed from the fourth century onwards.

That reading of the vulgar text however remains to be explained if possible, and remarkable without doubt it is. The intrusion of the Doxology after xiv 23 appears in two forms: conjointly with its retention at the end in AP 5 17[1], and some Armenian MSS: in this place alone in L (= J) and all Greek cursives but 8 (or 10), some MSS known to Origen (above, p. 59), the Harclean Syriac and the Gothic[2] (with, it is said,

[1] There is a doubt about 2 or 3 others, and more will probably be found in due time: see also p. 70, note 1. The introduction at xiv 23 by the second hand of the Latin text in the trilingual 109 is doubtless due to an imperfect assimilation to the Greek.

[2] The fragments of this version do not comprise xiv 20—xv 3. But the presence of the Doxology after xiv would make the gap exactly equal in length to the adjoining leaves of the

two other late and obscure versions), Chrysostom[1] and the Greek commentators who follow him, and perhaps Cyril and John of Damascus. Perplexities abound here. The first small group is select[2] though not trustworthy: by the analogy of other passages it indicates a reading of high antiquity, probably current at Alexandria, but a correction. Origen's MSS being waived, the certain portion of the second group is practically rubbish: that is, it contains no authority of the slightest value hereabouts except as a rare adjunct to some primary authority left nearly in solitude. That some MSS known to Origen should have attested a reading of the first group is exactly what might have been expected: their association with the second is passing strange. It suggests a doubt (more is not permissible) whether Origen after all did not speak of those MSS which had the Doxology at xiv 23 as having it also at the end. Rufinus's clumsy scissors may easily have shorn off the additional fact, especially as the antithesis became clearer in consequence: on this view the words about Marcion's doings '*not only* here but also in that place &c' would have increased force, though it must be allowed they do not require it. But another difficulty remains. We might have supposed the double position of the Doxology to be owing to the combination of texts from two sets of MSS, each of which had it in a different place and there alone; yet the character of the authorities inverts this order. In cases like this it is ultimately found safer to trust to the historical relations of the evidence than to any speculations about probability. But indeed here the only tolerable explanation that offers itself of the introduction of the Doxology at xiv 23 in *either* group would point to the first group as exhibiting the earlier form of corruption. Changes in the Greek text of the New Testament, chiefly by interpolation,

Codex Carolinus, which alone has preserved the verses before and after. The 4 existing leaves of this MS shew that xi 33—xv 13 was written on 8 leaves; and all the measures give the same length to a leaf within a line.

[1] One Vatican MS of Chrysostom according to Mr Field (p. 547) has both text and commentary in both places, and so might be added to the first group. But internal evidence proves that Chrysostom himself used only the vulgar Greek text.

[2] Though inferior to 17, 5 is a cursive of the first rank.

arising from the modifications required for Church lessons are common in MSS, though they have rarely found their way into printed texts. The salutations in xvi might easily be thought to disqualify the bulk of the chapter for public reading[1], especially at a time when but a few select lessons were taken from the whole Epistle[2]: and yet some church, for instance that of

[1] The Greek 'Euthalian' capitulation found in divers MSS (printed by Mill *N. T.* 418 and elsewhere) has for the heading of its § 18 περὶ [τῆς] μιμήσεως τῆς Χριστοῦ ἀνεξικακίας, of § 19 περὶ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐν ἀνατολῇ καὶ δύσει, and nothing after. These must correspond to xv 1—13, 14—33. It follows that xvi (but not xv) is omitted, evidently because not publicly read in *some* church. The latest sectional number (24) in P stands at xv 14, doubtless for a similar reason. By a singular coincidence § 18 of the Vatican capitulation begins with xv 1 as in the 'Euthalian' capitulation: but they do not coincide in the earlier chapters, and the Vatican sections proceed to the end, commencing § 19 at xv 25, § 20 at xv 30, and § 21 at xvi 17. Fritzsche (*Rom.* i p. xlvii) pleads that on the same grounds we might argue the exclusion of 1 Cor. xvi from public reading, since no trace of its contents appears in the 'Euthalian' capitulation for that epistle. Why not? The last sectional numeral (20) in the margin of P in 1 Cor. is at xv 51. Thus again both independent capitulations equally agree with what the nature of the chapter renders intrinsically likely. The Capuan Lectionary in the Fulda MS of the Latin Vulgate takes no lesson from Rom. xv xvi except xv 8—14 (for the Circumcision), and none from 1 Cor. xii—xvi.

[2] Dr Lightfoot (287) refers to Reiche as having shown that xv xvi were not omitted in public reading. Reiche depends on Fritzsche and after him Meyer, who argue (1) that the profound reverence of the early Christians must have saved every letter of the N. T. from being unheard in the churches; (2) that the lectionaries prove the whole epistle to have been actually read. But this continuous reading noted in the lectionaries belongs only to the Daily Lessons, which E. Ranke (Herzog *R. E.* xi 376 ff.) shews to be of late date, perhaps not earlier than the 12th century. The ancient lessons for Sundays and Saturdays are all more or less selected, continuous only in certain definite cases. The existing Synaxaria, *valeant quantum*, give Rom. xiv 19—23 *plus* the Doxology as the lesson (an appropriate one) for Saturday before 'Tyrophagus' Sunday (Quinquagesima): see the tables in Scrivener *Introd.* 72; Scholz *N. T.* ii 459; Matthæi *Rom.* xxiv. They have but two other lessons from this part of Romans, xv 1—7 for the 7th S. and xv 30—33 for the Saturday before the 10th S. after Pentecost (Scrivener 69 f.; Scholz 458; Matthæi *ib.*). All these arrangements however are probably Constantinopolitan, and originally derived from the 'use' of Antioch. An Alexandrine Table of Lessons is preserved in a Vatican MS (46 Paul. of Wetstein), and has been edited by Zacagni *Coll. Mon.* 712—722; but the first leaf, containing from Easter to the 3rd S. after Pentecost, is missing. In the part of the year where Romans is chiefly read, xiii 1—8, xv 1—6, 13—19, 30—33 oc-

Alexandria, may have been glad to rescue the striking Doxology at the end for congregational use by adding it to some neighbouring lesson[1]. It could not well be used by itself, even if it were longer: it craved to follow some passage which in like manner craved a close. Many would find in the benedictions at xv 13, 33 a reason against appending the Doxology in either place[2], while it would make an impressive termination to a lesson formed out of the latter verses of xiv which when alone have both a harsh[3] and an unfinished sound. Scribes accus-

cur consecutively; but no other lesson from this Epistle after xiv 11 appears anywhere. A few scattered lessons agree with those in the common Synaxaria, but the coincidences are such as might easily be accidental: the systems are independent throughout, though partly analogous. Saturday lessons are wanting, according to the custom of the early Alexandrine and Roman Churches (Socrat. v 22), except in Lent. But as it is the long eight-week Lent of *late* Alexandrine usage, comparison as to 'Tyrophagus' Saturday is out of the question. All the Lenten Saturdays have in place of a definite lesson the single obscure formula Ἐκ τοῦ ἀποστόλου εἰς ἁγίους: the 4 lessons εἰς μνείας ἁγίων, Rom. v 1—5; viii 28—34; Heb. x 32—38; xi 33—xii 2, can hardly be meant, as Zacagni seems to suppose; but the reference may be to a Menologium, or Table of Lessons for Holy-Days, not preserved in the MS: the common Synaxaria have lessons from Hebrews on the Saturdays of their Lent. 'Tyrophagus' *Sunday* is one of the days of coincidence, the lesson being Rom. xiii 11—xiv 4. In short nothing can be clearly made out, except the prevalence of variety of usage and the utmost freedom in the selection of lessons; that is, Fritzsche's and Meyer's arguments are found to have no support from facts.

[1] The late Alexandrine lesson for St Stephen's Day begins Acts vi 8 and ends vii 60. As the other lessons are all short, this must have been made up of two passages, the speech being omitted. A similar Old Latin lesson for St Stephen's Day has been printed by Ceriani (*Mon. S. et P.* i II 127 f.), combining vi 8—vii 2 with vii 51—viii 4. Ranke in Herzog *R. E.* x 81 notices two Mozarabic lessons from Jeremiah, one of which omits 13 verses in the midst, and the other is a cento of 5 fragments.

[2] Gabler in Griesbach *Opusc.* ii p. xxvi.

[3] This is the ground taken by J. A. Bengel (*App. Crit.* 340 Burk), to whom we owe the first suggestion about Church Lessons. He says "Videntur Græci, ne lectio publica in severam sententiam *Quicquid non est ex fide peccatum est* desineret, hanc ei clausulam attexuisse. Conf. var. Matth. iii 11." His note on the omission of καὶ πυρί in this last place is worth quoting. "Citra hæc verba finierunt Græci, v. gr. in *Aug.* 4 [the Lectionary numbered 24], lectionem ecclesiasticam, ne tristis esset clausula. Simili euphemismo et Judæi post ultimum eumque severum Iesaiæ, Malachiæ, Threnorum, et Koheleth versum rescribere penultimum solent: et Græci nonnulli post ultimum Malachiæ versum ponunt antepenulti-

tomed to hear it in that connexion in the public lessons would half mechanically introduce it into the text of St Paul, just as they seem to have introduced a liturgical doxology after the Lord's Prayer into the text of St Matthew (vi 13). Then in the course of time it would be seen that St Paul was not likely to have written the Doxology twice over in the same epistle, and it would be struck out in one place or the other; while familiar use would override any effort of critical judgement[1], and so the Doxology would vanish from the end of xvi, nothing in the context seeming to demand its retention. Such I conceive is the history of the position which the Doxology holds in the vulgar Greek text, a position which it would probably retain in the Received Text and in the popular versions of Europe but for the confused impulse which led Erasmus in this instance to adhere to the Latin tradition.

III. In the two places of the first chapter (7, 15), where the name of Rome is mentioned, it disappears in the single MS G. Some leaves are wanting at the beginning of F; doubtless if extant they would show the same omission. At the first passage there is a note in the margin of 47 to the effect that "he [or "it": no nominative] mentions the phrase ἐν Ῥώμῃ neither in the commentary nor in the text." The subject may be some unknown commentator, but is more likely to be an "ancient copy" of St Paul's Epistles which is expressly cited in a similar marginal note on vi 24[2], and which like 47 itself may have been provided with a marginal catena or 'commentary'[3]. Dr Lightfoot thinks he sees a trace of the

mum. Etiam in *Byz.* [86] τέλος primum post hæc verba, deinde his erasis ante, notatum est."

[1] Yet ancient criticism, *finding* the Doxology between xiv and xv, would probably see nothing to object to; while it would readily stumble at the apparent violation of epistolary correctness in xvi 25 ff. The influence of MSS like FG may also have helped to expel the final Doxology, while it would be powerless to displace the same words where imbedded firmly in the text.

[2] The reading there quoted from τὸ παλαιὸν ἀντίγραφον is both rare and excellent: the other marginal readings of 47 are of no interest, nor is there I believe any other reference to another authority. Cf. Griesbach *Symb. Crit.* i 155 ff.

[3] An uncial MS with a catena, like Ξ of St Luke, might be called "the ancient copy" in the 11th or 12th century.

same omission in Origen's criticism as rendered by Rufinus, notwithstanding the presence of *Romae* in the text. But the context gives another turn to the language used. "Benedictio autem pacis et gratiae, quam dat *dilectis Dei* ad quos scribit apostolus Paulus, puto quod non sit minor ea quae fuit benedictio in Sem et in Japheth, quoniam per Spiritum impleta est erga eos qui fuerant benedicti &c." "Ad quos scribit" is substituted for "qui erant Romae" because the point is that St Paul's benedictions had not less dignity and effect than the sacred benedictions of the Old Testament; as Origen proceeds "Non ergo his omnibus inferiorem duco hanc Apostoli benedictionem, qua benedixit ecclesias Christi," while any inference from the generality of "ecclesias" is precluded by the further remark that "haec Apostoli consuetudo scribendi non erga omnes ab eo servatur ecclesias," and by the classification which follows. Still less can I recognize any sign of the omission in the Ambrosian Hilary's words "Quamvis Romanis scribat, illis tamen scribere se significat, qui *in caritate Dei* sunt." For he goes on "Qui sunt hi nisi qui de Dei filio recte sentiunt? Isti *sancti* sunt et *vocati* dicuntur: sub lege enim agentes[1] male intelligunt Christum" &c. Every word becomes clear on comparison with a passage in the Prologue (25 AB) in which he contrasts the "Romani" with the Judaizers who were equally at Rome (*ἐν Ῥώμῃ*): the meaning is that St Paul writes not to all "at Rome" indiscriminately, but to those at Rome who were "in caritate Dei." The true text in full is *πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ κλητοῖς ἁγίοις*. A Western correction (D* lat. [the Greek lost] G, the 2 best MSS of the Vulgate, apparently the Ambrosian Hilary, and perhaps Hilary of Poitiers) substitutes *ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ* for *ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ*, doubtless on account of the *κλητοῖς* following ('who...through the love of God are called to be saints'). The result is that ΕΝΡΩΜΗ and ΕΝΑΓΑΠΗΘΥ were left contiguous, each beginning with *ἐν*. The loss of one or other out of a pair of such groups of letters is common in MSS of any form, and would be peculiarly liable to occur in one written in columns of short lines, such as was

[1] Not 'they *agentes*' but 'they who *agunt*'.

assuredly the archetype of FG[1]. These two MSS have further a trick of omitting words that do not appear necessary to the sense, as might easily be the case with ἐν Ῥώμῃ here when the following words were changed: so εἰς σωτηρίαν i 16; ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία ii 27; (οὐ πάντως iii 9;) Ἰησοῦ iii 26; μόνον iv 16; ὁ θάνατος v 12; (ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ vi 12;) ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται vii 21; εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν viii 10; υἱο-

[1] Hug pointed out (*Einl. in N. T.* i 252 ff.) the evidence afforded by the frequent capitals in G that it was copied from a 'stichometrical' MS resembling D, and perhaps older. In F many of the capitals are wanting, and probably even the scribe of G neglected a large proportion. It has not however been noticed, I believe, that the three equal chasms in the Greek text common to F and G measure for us the contents of each leaf of the archetype, about 20 lines of the 'Oxford Lloyd,' a convenient standard for reference. Now in these three places (1 Cor. iii 8—16; vi 7—14; Col. ii 1—8) a leaf of D contains on the average 24 lines of Lloyd, Greek alone. If then the archetype of FG had like D a Latin column, we might form a fair impression of the general appearance by cutting off 2 lines from each page of D. If there was no Latin, each leaf of the archetype must have contained rather less than those of any extant Biblical MS: the nearest approach would be to the purple and silver N (21 Lloyd lines) and the peculiar Z (23), apparently once a MS of the same class. E of the Acts has indeed but 12 Greek Lloyd lines; but there is the Latin in addition. One exception might have been found in the lost archetype of a part of C. A fortunate displacement of text in the midst of a page of the Apocalypse (x 9, 10; vii 17—viii 4; xi 3—12) proves, on accurate measurement and calculation, notwithstanding the loss of the preceding leaf, that the archetype hereabouts was made up of quires of 8 sheets, with 12 Lloyd lines to a leaf, while a leaf of C itself has 100 Lloyd lines. The outer sheet but one of a quire must have been somehow turned inside out before stitching, and so the scribe of C, copying on without thought, interchanged vii 17—viii 4 and x 10—xi 3. But it is possible, though unlikely, that the archetype of C was bilingual: the Græco-thebaic fragments of T have 21 Greek Lloyd lines to a leaf, nearly double. The great primary Eastern MSS of the 4th and 5th centuries, ℵABC (with 160, 148, 131, 100 Lloyd lines to a leaf respectively), owe I believe their stately appearance to the new impulse to exhibit together the settled and completed Canon of Scripture. Before Constantine the parchment copies were in all likelihood small and portable. Our two earliest MSS, ℵ and B, seem to represent the older period in the narrowness of their columns, not in the ample structure of their pages, which may or may not have been suggested by a partly opened papyrus roll. During the time when most variations arose, narrow columns were assuredly general, to say the least. The date when 'stichometry' proper began is still unknown: the evidence which refers it to the middle of the 5th century is most precarious. And the example of E of the Acts shews on how different scales stichometrical arrangements might be made.

θεσίαν viii 23; &c. The omission in i 7 might therefore be neglected without further thought but for the parallel omission of τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ in i 15, the name of Rome being confined to these two passages in the Epistle. The coincidence would certainly be noteworthy if it were sustained by other documentary evidence, or if there were independent reasons for believing a recension of the Epistle to have existed in which the marks of a special destination were purposely obliterated. There is no such reason apart from the supposed removal of xv xvi: the hypothesis is suggested by the reading of G at i 7, 15. We may therefore be content to suspect that in these two verses like causes produced like results.

All the phenomena of text alleged to prove a double recension have now been examined. The enigmatical Latin capitulation excepted, they have been found, if I mistake not, to be more naturally explicable by other causes. This result becomes clearer still when the hypothesis is examined as a whole. The second recension, it will be remembered, was said to consist of chapters i to xiv, with the Doxology, and without the two namings of Rome. How is it then that every authority, which supports, or may be thought to support, some part of this combination, contradicts some other part? For the omission of xv xvi the one direct testimony, if such it be, is that of Marcion: and yet the one incontrovertible fact about him is that he omitted the Doxology. If G is to be added on the strength of the blank space after xiv, yet again it leaves out the Doxology. Once more there is no lack of authorities of a sort for subjoining the Doxology to xiv. We may waive the fact that they all retain xv xvi. We cannot forget (1) that they all make mention of Rome at i 7, 15; and (2) that they have no sort of genealogical affinity with the MS that ignores Rome, or with Marcion. In few words, the authorities, which as a matter of fact contain the rude outlines of the first recension, supply the main data for constructing the second. Meanwhile neither recension is represented in the great mass of good authorities, Greek, Latin, Syriac, Egyptian, or other, on which the text of St Paul stands in ordinary cases. *Both re-*

censions, as wholes, are purely conjectural. If Rome and the transposed Benediction are set aside, the first recension is vouched for by FG (standing for a single archetype) alone of extant documents and by some traditional evidence. The second recension can be reached only through a hypothetical text which Marcion altered, and a hypothetical duplicate original of G.

Such being the relations of the textual evidence, little requires to be said on the intrinsic probability of the hypothesis. There is nothing in it that we need hesitate to accept if only the evidence were stronger. But it surely has not that kind of verisimilitude which would raise the feeling that it cannot but be true. The only analogous instance known to us is the encyclical epistle addressed to the Ephesians and other neighbouring churches. But that letter appears (1) to have been sent simultaneously to its different recipients; and (2) to have been general in form in the first instance, not a special appeal trimmed for general use. Analogy apart, it is difficult to imagine St Paul deliberately cutting out in after years the words that spoke of personal bonds to definite churches and believers, and the passionate hopes and fears which they had once called forth. If for any purpose he needed an impersonal treatise on the old subjects, he would surely have written it anew. Indeed the fitness of our Epistle, however altered, may well be doubted. Its catholicity springs from the marvellous balance that it holds between Jew and Gentile, which in its turn rises historically out of the equal or almost equal combination of the two bodies in the metropolitan Church, as Dr Lightfoot has justly insisted (288 ff.). Is it probable that the same characteristics would recur in the unlike "countries into which he had not yet penetrated" (294)? Even that single point of connexion disappears when we recall the pregnant paradox of his relation to the Romans, that, though he had not seen them, he knew them so well.

The inverse theory of several critics, that the original letter to the Romans ended with xiv and, some add, with the Doxology, and that St Paul afterwards appended xv xvi, escapes these difficulties to plunge into worse. Paley proves con-

vincingly that xv can belong only to the time when the body of the Epistle was written and can have been addressed only to the Romans: and there is cogent evidence which he has overlooked. Dr Lightfoot has shown how much can fairly be elicited from xvi to the same effect. The slight break moreover after xiv is onesided, and on the wrong side. The opening words of xv furnish a tolerable beginning: the last words of xiv make a very bad end, even when the Doxology is allowed to follow.

When all is said, two facts have to be explained, the insertion of the Doxology after xiv, and its omission. The former has occupied us enough already: the latter now claims a few words. If the view taken in this paper be right, the omitting authorities are FG, Marcion, and certain MSS twice noticed by Origen, once distinctly and both times implicitly, as having been corrupted by Marcion. The readings of D* and Sedulius, mixed authorities substantially akin to FG, likewise imply omission as antecedent. Origen accuses Marcion of wilful omission: is the charge just? There is analogy favourable to either answer. It is now equally certain that Marcion sometimes mutilated the text of his favourite apostle, and that some variations or omissions imputed to his pen were in fact simply the readings which he found already in his MS. The reference to 'prophetic Scriptures' in v. 26 might conceivably annoy him, though, as far as we know, he tolerated much of the same kind that was less likely to please him. But the removal of four words, an operation more in his manner, would have served every purpose. Though copies of his Apostolicon were seemingly current here and there in the Church, no extant document can be shown to have been affected by any of his wilful alterations. Indeed 'copies corrupted by Marcion' need mean to us no more than 'copies agreeing in a certain reading with Marcion's copy': and Marcion's copy, prior to his own manipulations, appears by various signs to have had much in common with the authorities associated with him in the omission of the Doxology. On the whole it is reasonably certain that the omission is his only as having been transmitted by him, in other words that it is a genuine ancient reading.

Genuine: but right or wrong? The question cannot be answered off-hand. Not right merely because shown to be as old as the first quarter of the second century: not wrong merely because the outward evidence for omission is small and at the same time virtually responsible for many impossible readings. Experience shows that authorities, rarely or never in the right when they alter or add, are often in the right when they omit. Such is preeminently the case with the Western group of which DFG form an important section. Yet the omissions of DFG without the accession of B, when examined together, are for the most part suspicious. Thus on the whole authority is in favour of the Doxology. Internal evidence is likewise not all on one side. So considerable an omission might be expected to proceed only from a strong and evident motive, such as cannot be decisively recognized here. On the other hand the singular and yet unobtrusive correspondence with those parts of the letter which best reveal its purpose is an argument hardly to be gainsayed without strong documentary testimony. Pure accident is not to be rejected from the imaginable causes of the loss. The last or outer column of a papyrus roll, the outer leaf of a parchment book, would be subject to peculiar risks, as every keeper of MSS can avouch; and it is probable that an epistle as long as that to the Romans would often form a book to itself in early times[1]. Nor again dare we assume that the rash hands which shifted the Benediction would hesitate to let go the Doxology, in their zeal to give the Epistle a correct ending. Having once lost the vantage ground of possession from whatever cause, the Doxology would not easily recover it.

[1] On the scale of the archetype of C this epistle would occupy 90 leaves. They would necessarily be small, and usually of coarse thick parchment, the delicate thin vellum of our great MSS being a recognized mark of luxury; and would thus form a sufficient volume. The variety of order in the Pauline epistles in early times, of which there is good evidence, would be promoted by their separate use. On this view the language used by Constantine and Eusebius (*V. Const.* iv 36 f.) about the new Imperial Bibles, "sumptuously prepared," with their quires of 3 or 4 sheets, has more force: Constantine's word *σωμάτιον* (= *corpus*), the technical term for a combination of single works, doubtless expresses the change from books and groups of books to the full Canon.

Henceforth conservatism and criticism would be on the same side. Presently, when the Doxology had found a home after the fourteenth chapter, every motive for replacing it at the end of the Epistle was gone. We cannot wonder that the evidence for retaining it there, and leaving inviolate the continuity of the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters, is exclusively ancient and good[1].

F. J. A. HORT.

[1] Since this article has been in type, Dr Lightfoot has kindly pointed out to me an oversight in pp. 66 f., 76. In the Codex Fuldensis the table of headings to Romans agrees with that in the Codex Amiatinus &c. only in the latter part, as Ranke himself observes, p. xxiii. The first 23 headings belong to a totally different capitulation, and exhaust the Epistle down to xiv 13. Then follows No. 24 of the other table, describing ix 1—5; and so on. The previous or peculiar headings have no marks or divisions answering to them in the text itself. The scribe evidently saw that his tale of 51 sections could not be made up without borrowing elsewhere, and he ventured to save appearances at the cost of sense. Whether he had actually reached the end of the first table or only saw it near at hand, is less clear. The headings are not so exactly descriptive as to forbid the inclusion of xiv 14—23 in § 23; and thus it is certainly possible that we have two complete and independent Latin capitulations in which xv xvi are omitted. More cannot be said till ancient capitulations generally have been properly investigated, and this demands a wide examination of MSS. Meanwhile it should be observed that (1) the Fulda headings have no trace of the Doxology; and (2) they are loaded with Augustinian or Anti-Pelagian phraseology, and cannot therefore be dated much before 400 at earliest.

The sectional numerals in P, I now likewise see, may possibly once have been continued after Rom. xv 14; 1 Cor. xv 51: some numerals have faded out of sight in almost every epistle, and in Rom. i—x all have vanished; cf. Tischendorf *M.S.I.* v p. xiv. But as the § 1 of each epistle (10) except 1 Cor. begins after the salutation, analogy favours the view taken above (p. 71, n. 1).

ON THE ENNEAKRUNOS AT ATHENS.

Pausanias, in his description of Athens, after conducting the reader from the gate at which he entered to the western foot of the Acropolis, mentions among other objects which he saw at that spot a fountain called Enneakrunos. But modern topographers, to a man, have asserted that he must assuredly have been mistaken; that there cannot be any reasonable doubt that Enneakrunos was really at the south-eastern extremity of the city, near the Olympium; and that Pausanias, therefore, in mentioning it in this order, must have made an unaccountable leap over half the diameter of the city, without notice, and without mentioning any intermediate object.

Leake (Vol. I. p. 238 sq.) explains this extraordinary leap by supposing that Pausanias took it in order to connect his narrative respecting the successors of Alexander the Great, which begins at the eighth chapter and continues down to the fourteenth; the statues of the Ptolemies before the Odeum, which stood near the fountain in question, affording an opportunity for such connexion.

But, if this was the motive of Pausanias for disturbing the lucid order of his narration, and puzzling his readers by so gross a piece of topographical blundering, we might at least suppose that he would have confined himself to the Odeum, which was the cause of his deviation; instead of which we also find him describing not only the fountain, but also the temple of Demeter and Coré, of Triptolemus, of Eucleia, and other objects, which he had a better opportunity to do when he afterwards arrived, in a proper order, at this part of the city. And after this unseasonable episode, he as suddenly skips back again to the Kerameikos (I. 14, 5).

But, as Leake admits (p. 239), the narrative is not even then consecutive; for it is interrupted in the eighth chapter to describe several statues and other objects which were undoubtedly at the west end of the Acropolis; and indeed Leake himself has placed them there: as the statues of the eponymi of the tribes, those of Amphiaraus, Eirene, Lycurgus, Demosthenes, &c.; and the temple of Ares, with several neighbouring statues, and especially those of Harmodius and Aristogeiton.

Curtius (*Attische Studien*, No. II. p. 15) explains the origin of the supposed blunder of Pausanias as follows: "The most extraordinary thing is the Enneakrunos episode, which is not only at variance with any reasonable plan, but is also in itself difficult to comprehend as a separate part of the peregrination, since a later tour brings us back to the same neighbourhood. Nor can we assume a mutilation of the text, since we evidently have two excursions. Wherefore, if we are not disposed to ascribe this irregularity to circumstances beyond all combination, we are led to the following supposition. The places which Pausanias names in his first walk to the Ilissus, viz. the Odeum, Enneakrunos, the temples of Demeter and Koré, as well as those of Triptolemus and Eukleia, all lie near the Itonian Gate. Pausanias first entered by this gate, and having afterwards learnt better (eines Besseren belehrt) and begun a new and more correct itinerary, which commenced at the principal entrance on the west, it appears to me not impossible that as he had visited and described those points immediately on his first entrance, so that they formed a separate group in his journal, he afterwards inserted the description in another place, in order not to separate the remarkable objects in the inner town. That he has not done this more cleverly need not surprise us, seeing how little art and practice Pausanias displays in drawing up his description of Attica."

This explanation seems a great deal more far-fetched and unsatisfactory than that of Leake. For, first, if Pausanias had entered the city, as Curtius says he did (Da nun Pausanias zuerst in dies Thor *eingetreten ist*), how could he have possibly seen these objects? For the Ilissus, on which Enneakrunos and the objects named, are supposed to have been, was un-

doubtedly without the walls, as the great majority of topographers, including Curtius himself, rightly conclude; and as a passage in the *Axiochus*, which will be cited in the course of this article, indisputably shews to have been the fact.

Again: Pausanias himself believed that Enneakrunos was within the walls, as appears from his saying that though there were many wells throughout the city, that was the only fountain, or spring, in it (*φρέατα μὲν γὰρ καὶ διὰ πάσης τῆς πόλεώς ἐστι, πήγη δὲ αὕτη μόνη.* I. 14, 1). And the remark becomes absurd if we extend it to springs *without* the walls, to which there could have been no limit.

Further: it is not certain that the Itonian Gate led to Phalerum, whence Pausanias had started on his first excursion. But, waiving this objection about the name, and allowing that Pausanias actually entered the city by some gate or another in his first walk, he saw only one object there, viz. the monument of Antiope, as he tells us (cap. 2 init.); and if the Enneakrunos, the temple of Demeter and Kora, &c., had been there, why does he not say so on this occasion?

Lastly: to vilify and depreciate the powers of an ancient author is no uncommon practice with some critics when they are unable to comprehend, or will not take the trouble to investigate, his meaning. And here the imputation on Pausanias is the more gross, amounting in fact to the charge of not possessing the most ordinary common sense; since, as is well known, and mentioned by Curtius himself, the book on Attica is a second and revised edition; and Pausanias must therefore have committed this egregious blunder with a negligence amounting to stupidity.

This appears to me a very wrong method of using the ancient authors. We ought, I think, in the first instance, to submit our judgment to their authority, and try to reconcile with it circumstances which at first sight appear to be incompatible. This method I shall follow on the present occasion; and assuming that Pausanius was not guilty of the blunder ascribed to him, shall even claim his evidence in support of the view that the Enneakrunos was never on the Ilissus at all, but at the western extremity of the Acropolis.

We shall first examine the authorities adduced by Leake to the contrary (Vol I. p. 172 sqq.), which he considers so conclusive as not to leave any "reasonable doubt that Enneakrunos was really at the south-eastern extremity of the city."

The first proofs adduced are the following passages from Herodotus and Thucydides, which, as they serve for mutual illustration, we put together.

Ὡς δὲ αὐτοὶ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι, δικαίως ἐξελάσαι· κατοικημένους γὰρ τοὺς Πελασγοὺς ὑπὸ τῷ Ὑμησσῷ, ἐνθεῦτεν ὁρμεωμένους, ἀδικέειν τάδε. φοιτᾶν γὰρ αἰεὶ τὰς σφετέρας θυγατέρας τε καὶ τοὺς παῖδας ἐπ' ὕδωρ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐννεάκρουνον, οὐ γὰρ εἶναι τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον σφίσι κω οὐδὲ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι Ἕλλησι οἰκέτας. ὅκως δὲ ἔλθοιεν αὗται, τοὺς Πελασγοὺς ὑπὸ ὕβριός τε καὶ ὀλιγωρίης βιᾶσθαι σφέας.—Herod. VI. 137.

τὸ δὲ πρὸ τούτου, ἡ ἀκρόπολις ἡ νῦν οὖσα, πόλις ἦν, καὶ τὸ ὑπ' αὐτὴν πρὸς νότον μάλιστα τετραμμένον. τεκμήριον δέ· τὰ γὰρ ἱερὰ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀκροπόλει καὶ ἄλλων θεῶν ἐστι, καὶ τὰ ἔξω πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως μᾶλλον ἵδρυται, τό τε τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου, καὶ τὸ Πύθιον, καὶ τὸ τῆς Γῆς, καὶ τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου, ᾧ τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια τῇ δωδεκάτῃ ποιεῖται ἐν μηνὶ Ἀνθεστηριῶνι, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἀπ' Ἀθηναίων Ἴωνες ἔτι καὶ νῦν νομίζουσιν. ἵδρυται δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἱερὰ ταύτῃ ἀρχαῖα. καὶ τῇ κρήνῃ τῇ νῦν μὲν τῶν τυράννων οὕτω σκευασάντων, Ἐννεακρούνῳ καλουμένῃ, τὸ δὲ πάλαι, φανερῶν τῶν πηγῶν οὐσῶν, Καλλιρόῃ ὠνομασμένῃ, ἐκείνῃ[1] τε ἐγγὺς οὔσῃ τὰ πλείστου ἄξια ἐχρῶντο, καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου πρό τε γαμικῶν καὶ ἐς ἄλλα τῶν ἱερῶν νομίζεται τῷ ὕδατι χρῆσθαι. καλεῖται δὲ διὰ τὴν παλαιὰν ταύτῃ κατοίκησιν καὶ ἡ ἀκρόπολις μέχρι τοῦδε ἔτι ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων πόλις.—Thucyd. II. 15.

Leake comments on the former of these passages as follows:

[1] This is the reading of all the codices, which Bekker has arbitrarily altered to ἐκεῖνοι. Ἐκείνη is here used pleonastically, as the demonstrative often is both in Greek and Latin, as τὸ γὰρ τελευταῖόν σοι πιεῖν ἐνεχθὲν, ἐκεῖνο δευρὶ κατέπεμψέ σε. Lucian, *Catapl.* T. I. p. 633 (Amst. 1743). καὶ Κόροιβον δὲ καὶ Μιλτιάδην καὶ ἐκείνους ἀνοήτους φασίν. Ælian. *V. H.* XIII. 15: Ὑμεῖς δὲ τῷ δι' ἀπληστίαν τε καὶ ἀκρασίαν ἁρπάζοντι πάντα τούτῳ μάλιστα ἐοίκατε. Lucian, *Cynic* 8, T. III. p. 543: μόνη δὲ Καλλιῤῥόη γενομένη, ἥδε μετ' ἐξουσίας τὴν ἰδίαν ἀπωδύρετο τύχην. Chariton, *De Chær.*, &c. lib. I. c. 14. In Latin: Sall. *Cat.* 7: Cic. *De Orat.* III. 13, &c. See Drakenborch, *ad Liv.* XXV. 27, *init.*

"Herodotus relates on the authority of Athenian traditions that the Pelasgi, to whom lands had been assigned at the foot of Hymettus, as a reward for having fortified the acropolis, were afterwards expelled from thence, because, among other offences, they ill treated the sons and daughters of the Athenians when the latter were sent (there being at that time no servants in Greece) to draw water from Enneacrunos. The fountain therefore was on the side of Athens towards Hymettus, a position confirmed by Thucydides, who thus describes Athens as it existed before the time of Theseus."

And he then gives the following version of the passage from Thucydides: "The city then consisted of that which is now the citadel, together with that portion of the present city which lies below it towards the south. A proof of this fact is afforded by the temples of the gods; for some of these are in the citadel, and in the other situation are those of Jupiter Olympius, of Apollo Pythius, of the Earth, and that of Bacchus in the marshes, at which the more ancient Dionysiac festival is celebrated at the twelfth of the month Anthesterion; a custom still observed by the Ionians, who are descended from the Athenians. There are other ancient sanctuaries in the same quarter, as well as the fountain, which from having been fitted with nine pipes by the tyrants [the Peisistratidæ], is called Enneacrunos, but which when the natural sources were open, was named Callirrhoë: this spring, being near the sanctuaries, was resorted to for all the most important offices of religion, and still continues to be employed by women prior to their nuptials, as well as for other sacred purposes in the temples. It is in memory of this ancient condition of the city that the Acropolis is even to this day called Polis by the Athenians."

Had Leake extended his quotation a little further, he would have come upon a flat contradiction between the two great historians. Herodotus, in the passage just quoted, says that the ground assigned to the Pelasgi was under Hymettus; while Thucydides, in the next chapter but one, says that it was under the Acropolis (*τό τε Πελασγικὸν καλούμενον τὸ ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν*, II. 17): and Pausanias says the same thing

(*τῇ δὲ ἀκροπόλει περιβαλεῖν τὸ λοιπὸν λέγεται τοῦ τείχους Πελασγοὺς οἰκησαντάς ποτε ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν*, I. 28, 3). Now this fact, if Thucydides was right—and he was likely to know more than Herodotus about Athens—suffices to destroy Leake's inference, that Enneakrunos "was on the side of Athens towards Hymettus." Further, even had the Pelasgi been seated under Hymettus, that circumstance alone suffices not to make the inference conclusive. For if they could have gone to the Ilissus, where Enneakrunos is supposed to have been, they might easily have proceeded to the Acropolis, where, as I hope to shew, the fountain really was.

There is another contradiction between the two authorities, which, however, is perhaps more apparent than real. Thucydides says that the fountain was not called Enneakrunos till the time of the Pisistratidæ; yet in the passage cited, we find Herodotus applying that name to it at a much earlier period. The only way in which we can explain this contradiction is by supposing that Herodotus used that name, instead of Kallirrhoë, by a *prolepsis*, in order to prevent confusion with some other fountain, or stream. Nor was this precaution unnecessary, as there evidently were, or had been, two Kallirrhoës at Athens, and of these one, no doubt, was at the Ilissus. For in the Platonic dialogue entitled *Axiochus*, Socrates is represented as having issued from a gate of the city, and as having got to the Ilissus (which, therefore, was outside the walls), when he heard somebody calling him, and on turning round, beheld Kleinias running towards Kallirrhoë (*Ἐξιόντι μοι ἐς Κυνόσαργες καὶ γενομένῳ μοι κατὰ τὸν Ἰλισσὸν, διῆξε φωνὴ βοῶντός του, Σώκρατες, Σώκρατες. ὡς δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς περιεσκόπουν ὁπόθεν εἴη, Κλεινίαν ὁρῶ τὸν Ἀξιόχου θέοντα ἐπὶ Καλλιρόην, Axioch. init.*). Now as Thucydides tells us that, after the time of the Pisistratidæ, the spring Kallirrhoë came to be called Enneakrunos, and as we find that this latter name was in use several centuries after, since Pausanias employs it, we are compelled to the conclusion that the author of the *Axiochus* could not have been alluding to the fountain, but to some part of the Ilissus called Kallirrhoë. For it would have been indeed absurd to have continued calling

Enneakrunos, Kallirrhoë, after its conversion into an artificial fountain had concealed those natural springs, which, when they lay open to view, had occasioned its original appellation. And here probably may be detected the source of the error which led writers of a very late period to place Enneakrunos on the Ilissus.

That Enneakrunos was distinct from, and coexisted with a Kallirrhoë, may also be shewn from other authorities. Pliny, enumerating the Attic fountains, says: "Cephisia, Larine, Calliroe, Enneacrunos" (*N. H.* lib. IV. 7, 11): where modern editors, including Sillig, have printed: Calliroe Enneacrunos: without a comma between the words, assuming that Pliny wrote them down as identical, and, as Meursius says, by apposition. But as Pliny was reckoning up the actual number of the fountains, he would surely have given his readers notice that these were only two different names for the same object, and have inserted *seu*, or some such word, between them.

Solinus, in a manner still more marked, mentions Kallirrhoë and Enneakrunos as two distinct fountains; "Callirhoen stupent fontem: nec ideo Enneacrunon, fontem alterum, nulli rei numerant" (*Polyhist.* cap. XIII.): for which he has been blamed by several eminent critics, and defended by one or two others. Duker (ad Thucyd. II. 15, note 8) takes part against him, but does not seem to have been aware of the passage which we have quoted from the *Axiochus*. He appeals to the testimony of Harpocration, Hesychius, and other grammarians. But when these writers say under Ἐννεάκρουνος: *κρήνη τις ἐν Ἀθήναις· πρότερον δ' ἐκαλεῖτο Καλλιρόη*, they only repeat what we have already learnt from Thucydides, and do not exclude the possibility of *another* Kallirrhoë.

When Statius writes:

> Et quos Callirhoë novies errantibus undis
> Implicat, et raptae qui conscius Orithyiae
> Celavit Geticos ripis Ilissus amores.—(*Theb.* XII. 629),

he confounds, as a Latin poet easily might, the original spring with the subsequent fountain; but his mentioning it separately from the Ilissus, shews that he considered it to have been unconnected with that river.

If we examine the passage of Thucydides adduced by Leake a little closer, we shall find, I think, nothing contrary to this view, or in favour of placing Enneakrunos at the Ilissus. Leake translates the words: ἐκείνῃ τε ἐγγὺς οὔσῃ, κ. τ. λ.: "this spring, *being near the sanctuaries*, was resorted to for all the most important offices of religion." This, however, is not what his author says, but, that the ancient Athenians, who dwelt in the acropolis, used the spring because it was *near them*[1]. This makes a very essential difference; since, as the temple of Zeus Olympius is one of the sanctuaries named, if the historian really said what he is made to say, it would be a strong argument in favour of Enneakrunos being on the Ilissus, and near the temple in question. But, properly interpreted, his words afford as strong an argument the other way. For the assumed site of the fountain is at least three quarters of a mile from the western, and only, entrance to the acropolis (it took me a full quarter of an hour to walk thither at a fair pace); and it could not therefore, with propriety, be called *near* those who dwelt in it. The passage, in fact, is in favour of the fountain being at the acropolis.

Let us further remark that the Olympium lies S. E. of the acropolis, and therefore when Thucydides mentions that and other sanctuaries as lying about S. of it, it is probable that he named the Olympium first (together with the Pythium, a kind of adjunct to it,—Strabo, IX. 404), because it was the easternmost of the group, and that the other temples mentioned lay to the west of it. And it is a confirmation of this inference that the temple of Dionysus in the Limnæ, which is one of them, is known to have been under the acropolis. Thucydides then alludes generally to other temples in this vicinity without naming them, and mentions the fountain last; whence a fair inference may be drawn that this was the westernmost of the objects

[1] It may be observed that Leake makes another little slip in translating ἐς ἄλλα τῶν ἱερῶν, "as well as for other sacred purposes *in the temples*." The last words are not in his author; and in fact the λουτρά were not brought to the temples, but to the houses of the bride and groom. Thus Photius: ἔθος ἦν τοῖς γαμοῦσιν Ἀθήνησι λουτρὰ μεταπέμπεσθαι ἑαυτοῖς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ γάμου ἡμέραν. Voc. Λουτροφόρος, 231, 17.

named, and consequently near the entrance to the acropolis, as we have already inferred from Pausanias, as well as from the words of Thucydides himself. On the other hand, had it been the easternmost object, and near the temple of Zeus, he would surely have mentioned it in connexion with that sanctuary. We may also observe that Thucydides names among the group a temple of Gë, or the Earth, and we know from Pausanias (I. 22, 3) that there was really a temple of that divinity near the south-western extremity of the acropolis. There was also indeed in the Olympian enclosure a *temenos*, or piece of ground, consecrated to Gë; but Thucydides is speaking more particularly of temples (*ἱερά*), and uses the word *ἵδρυται* in connexion with them, are *built*, or *founded*. But—not to press the meaning of *ἱερόν* too closely—were he even alluding to the sanctuary of the Olympian Gë, still that also was to the W. of the temple of Zeus, as it lay towards the Itonian Gate and monument of the Amazon (Plut. *Thes.* 27).

The next piece of evidence adduced by Leake is the following passage from Hierocles, in the preface to his *Hippiatrics:* Ταραντῖνος δὲ ἱστορεῖ τὸν τοῦ Διὸς νεὼν κατασκευάζοντας Ἀθηναίους Ἐννεακρούνου πλησίον εἰσελαθῆναι ψηφίσασθαι τὰ ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς εἰς τὸ ἄστυ ζεύγη ἅπαντα: which Leake takes to mean, "that when the Athenians were building the temple of Jupiter *near* Enneakrunos, they ordered all the beasts of burden in Attica to be brought to the city." And he proceeds to remark: "There was no temple of Jupiter at Athens, of any celebrity, except that of Jupiter Olympius, and its remains are found near the source of water at the south-eastern extremity of the site of Athens" (p. 174).

But, as there was no temple of Jupiter, or rather Zeus, at Athens, of any celebrity, except that of the Olympian—and that indeed was of world-wide notoriety—where was the necessity for identifying it as being near a fountain? It would seem very absurd to define the site of St Paul's cathedral as near Peel's statue, or of the Tower of London as near the postern well; though on the other hand we might naturally indicate to a stranger the statue or the well as being near structures of such universal notoriety. Wherefore I take it

that πλησίον is not to be construed with κατασκευάζοντας but with εἰσελαθῆναι, and that the sense is: "they ordered the beasts of burden to be driven into the city near Enneakrunos." And so I find the passage translated by Meursius, who puts a comma between *exstruentes* and *Enneacrunum:* "Tarentinus vero refert, Athenienses, templum Jovis exstruentes, prope fontem Enneacrunum decreto mandasse, ut omnia tota Attica jumenta in Urbem abducerentur" (*Ceram. Gem.* c. 14, Opera, t. I. p. 493).

The next proof is from the Etymologicum Magnum: Ἐννεάκρουνος, κρήνη Ἀθήνησι παρὰ τὸν Ἰλισσὸν ἣ πρότερον Καλλιρόη ἔσκεν. Now the author of this lexicon, who flourished about the tenth or eleventh century, is the first authority who says *disertis verbis* that Enneakrunos was *at the Ilissus:* and if this was a fact, it is a singular circumstance that it should not have been mentioned by Harpocration, Hesychius, and the older lexicographers. Even in the lexicon of Photius, who lived a century or two earlier than the author of the Etymologicum, we read: τὰ δὲ λουτρὰ ἐκόμιζον ἐκ τῆς νῦν μὲν Ἐννεακρούνου καλουμένης κρήνης, πρότερον δὲ Καλλιρόης (voc. Λουτροφόρος, 231. 23): where *the more recent hand* of a person who thought that he knew better than Photius has added ("addidit m. recens") ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν αὕτη Καλλιρόη καλεῖται. And in like manner Suidas, also a late lexicographer, reversing the words of Thucydides and the earlier grammarians: Καλλιρόη κρήνη ἡ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἥτις πρότερον Ἐννεάκρουνος ἐκαλεῖτο.

What conclusion can be drawn from these variations, which occur only in works belonging to the tenth or later centuries, than that between their time and that of Photius, who flourished in the ninth century, the true site of Enneakrunos had fallen into oblivion, probably from the spring having been diverted, or become extinct; and that the grammarians of that later period, because they found that a spring called Kallirrhoë and a fountain called Enneakrunos had once been identified, now began to imagine that the fountain was that other Kallirrhoë on the Ilissus? For that the real Enneakrunos, an artificial fountain, should ever have regained the name which it bore when its sources lay open, surpasses all belief.

Leake's last proof, from ancient authorities, is the following fragment of Cratinus (*Schol. in Arist. Eq.* 523):

> Ἄναξ Ἄπολλον, τῶν ἐπῶν τῶν ῥευμάτων·
> Καναχοῦσι πηγαὶ, δωδεκάκρουνον (τὸ) στόμα,
> Ἰλισσὸς ἐν (τῇ) φάρυγγι. Τί ἂν εἴποιμί σοι;
> Εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἐπιβύσει τις αὐτοῦ τὸ στόμα,
> Ἅπαντα ταῦτα κατακλύσει ποιήμασιν.

We need not dwell, I suppose, on this passage. Twelve are not nine; nor does it follow because two objects are mentioned in the same lines, that they were therefore together in place. On the contrary, it rather affords a presumption that they were separate and distinct objects.

It remains to examine the proofs which Leake adduces (p. 175) from modern appearances and names.

There is, it is said, near the Olympium, a streamlet of water issuing from the foot of a ledge of rock, which here crosses the bed of the Ilissus, so that in times of rain the spring is enveloped in a small cascade of the river falling over the rock; but which, when the bed is in its ordinary state, that is to say, dry, or nearly so, forms a pool, which is permanent in the midst of summer. The spring is still called, as well as the river itself, Kallirrhoë [Καλλιῤῥόη], so that there cannot be any question of the identity.

To the same purpose Dr Wordsworth, speaking of Callirrhoë, says, "The current of the river, or torrent rather, is here divided into two streams; the one nearer the left bank comes down over a stone bed cut and worn into a large and deep trough; the other division of the stream finds its way through the rock by subterranean artificial κροῦνοι, or pipes, bored through it, which suggested the description of Cratinus: seven of them are yet visible[1]."

On these passages it may be remarked: first, that there is nothing surprising that the pool, or rather the river itself at this point, should still be called Kallirrhoë, seeing that it bore that name ages before, and at least as early as the time of Socrates.

[1] *Athens and Attica*, ch. 21. Col. Mure also observed seven orifices.—*Tour in Greece*, Vol. II. p. 86.

But this circumstance does not identify it with Enneakrunos, as Leake supposes, on the assumption that there could have been only one Kallirrhoë.

Secondly, with regard to the pipes mentioned by Dr Wordsworth, which I was not fortunate enough to see, it may be observed that seven are not nine.

Again: Enneakrunos was originally a natural fountain, and its sources when it retained its first name of Kallirrhoë, were open to the view; while the object described by Dr Wordsworth could never have been a natural spring at all, but merely, as he himself says, an apparatus for conducting the water through the rock from the upper stream into the pool. And this apparatus was evidently nothing more than part of a Turkish fountain. For Wheler, who visited Athens towards the end of the seventeenth century, saw at this place two Turkish fountains ("Descending yet a little further by the river, some rocks seem to stop its course; whereby the water begins to appear again, and settle in a kind of pool upon the rocks....The Turks after their mode have accommodated two fountains to this spring," *Journey, &c.*, p. 379). And these were still to be seen when Chandler went there about a century afterwards. For he says: "The current is now conveyed into the town, and only the holes, at which it issued into the cistern, remain. These are in the rocky bank next to the temple of Jupiter Olympius, which is in the way to the gate dividing the cities of Theseus and Hadrian, and not remote. At a little distance is a modern ruinous fountain." (*Travels in Greece*, Vol. II. ch. 16, p. 95. ed. 1817.) Whence it is clear that the holes which Chandler saw were the remains of the other Turkish fountain seen by Wheler.

In fact, a fountain in the middle of a river, which in ancient times, too, was much more abundantly supplied with water than it is now (though even at present it would be subject at times to be enveloped in a cascade), seems a palpable absurdity. On this subject Col. Mure very justly observes, although he accepts the Ilissus for the site of the fountain: "From this arrangement of the pipes it may be inferred that any little moisture the bed of the Ilissus occasionally afforded, was also made available for the supply of the fountain. Its purity, however,

could hardly fail to be disturbed by the waters of the stream when in a swollen state[1]." The Turkish fountains, constructed "after their mode," when the stream was become drier, were evidently only a sort of water-works. Leake, however, at the conclusion of his argument combats such a notion as follows: "That Enneakrunos, or the ancient Callirrhoë, was a separate vein of water, and not an artificial derivation from the Ilissus, was proved by an excavation which the primates of Athens made about the year 1804, at the pool above mentioned, when a brisk stream of water made its appearance, evidently distinct from the Ilissus, and having a course from the northward into the above-mentioned pool of water. In fact the Ilissus receives several subterraneous veins of water from Hymettus and Anchesmus: these form pools in the dry bed of the torrent, which are resorted to by the Athenian women for the washing of linen."

This paragragh proves too much, the second sentence nullifying the first: for, as there are several such veins and pools, it is evident that Enneakruni might be produced *ad libitum*. Nobody denies that water might be found near the Ilissus by digging for it; but such a proceeding would not make a natural spring, as the Kallirrhoë was which existed before the time of the Pisistratidæ.

To recapitulate. It has been shewn that Pausanias places Enneakrunos at the western extremity of the Acropolis; that the evidence of Thucydides corroborates this position; and that Herodotus says nothing which may not be reconciled with it. It has been further shewn, from the dialogue named *Axiochus*, that a point on the Ilissus was called Callirrhoë, and that it could not have been identical with Enneakrunos because, as we are told by Thucydides, the Callirrhoë which was converted into that fountain afterwards lost its name. Yet that an Enneakrunos and a Callirrhoë subsequently co-existed is evident also from Pliny and Solinus enumerating them as distinct fountains. Solinus represents Callirrhoë as much the more magnificent one; and so of course it would be, from the natural cascade, and the

[1] *Tour in Greece*, ubi supra.

largeness of the pool at this point of the Ilissus. It has also been shewn, that, about the tenth or eleventh century of our era, writers began to confound Enneakrunos with this Callirrhoe. Lastly, the appearances which still exist at this spot, do not coincide with a fountain of nine pipes, nor indeed with any fountain at all, properly so called; and are, in all probability, the remains of Turkish water-works.

If these things have been proved, then the following advantages are gained: Pausanias is found to be consistent in his topography, which increases the value of his evidence regarding other matters; while the group of temples, &c., which he places in the vicinity of Enneakrunos, are discovered to have been within, instead of without, the city walls; a situation much more probable, and more suitable for them, especially in the case of the Odeum.

THOS. H. DYER.

April 25th, 1870.

ON THE LENGTHENING OF SHORT FINAL SYLLABLES IN VERGIL.

THE fact that Vergil allowed himself certain licences in the way of lengthening short final syllables, licences which were wholly or in great part avoided by his immediate predecessors in poetry, has, as was natural, often been noticed. The most detailed discussion of the matter is that of Philip Wagner in no. XII of his *Quaestiones Vergilianae*. Gossrau has a paragraph upon it in the "Excursus de Hexametro Vergilii" affixed to his edition of the Aeneid of 1846: but this paragraph is, as the writer himself professes, little more than a simpler reproduction of what Wagner had said. The subject is treated briefly by Lachmann (on Lucr. 2. 27) and comprehensively by Lucian Müller (De Re Metrica, p. 324—333): but A. Weidner (Commentar zu Virgil's Aeneis I und II) takes no notice of the instances occurring in those books. While Ph. Wagner and Lucian Müller would account for these licences almost entirely on the ground of the position of the word in the verse, the Plautine critics [1] Ritschl, Fleckeisen, and W. Wagner) have thought that in some cases at least Vergil was not unconscious of the same uncertainty of quantity which prevailed in the earlier period of Latin poetry. The object of this paper is to show that neither explanation is wholly true: that Vergil, while probably unconscious of any grammatical or etymological propriety in the employment of these scansions, still did not employ them without due selection and a regard to the usage of

[1] Ritschl, *Prolegomena to Trinummus*. Fleckeisen, *Neue Jahrbücher*, LXI. p. 17, foll. W. Wagner, *Introduction to Aulularia*.

the earlier writers, however imperfectly this usage was understood in his own day.

The most decided innovation[1] introduced into the hexameter by Vergil, the lengthening of the first *que* in verse-beginnings like "Liminaque laurusque Dei" or verse-endings like "Noemonaque Prytanimque", need not detain us, as it is an obvious imitation of Homer's Λάμπον τε Κλύτιόν τε, Προθοήνωρ τε Κλόνιός τε κ.τ.λ. In Homer τε is mostly lengthened before double consonants, liquids, and sibilants; and Vergil has scrupulously followed his master. Of the sixteen instances collected by Wagner fourteen present *que* lengthened before a double consonant: the other two are "Liminaque laurusque" (A. 3. 91) and "Eurique Zephyrique" (G. 1. 371). Neither is it necessary to dwell upon endings like "molli fultus hyacintho", "linquens profugus hymenaeos", which, like Catullus' "non despexit hymenaeos", "novo auctus hymenaeo", are mere imitations of the Greek.

The rest of these licences are distinctly traceable to Roman sources, and require a longer consideration.

The early poetry of Greece and Rome is marked by considerable uncertainty of quantity: thus in the Homeric poems we have both ᾽ᾰνήρ and ᾽ᾰνήρ, φῐ̆λος and φῐ̄λος, ᾽ᾰπονέεσθαι and ᾽ᾰπονέεσθαι and so on. This uncertainty is observable in Latin chiefly in the final syllables of nouns and verbs: a fact probably due in great measure to the rule of Latin accentuation, which forbade the accent to fall on the last syllable. Final syllables which were long by nature were obscured by the backward position of the accent, and gradually became short. This process did not stop at the Augustan age, but continued till even the final *o* of the present indicative was shortened by hexameter poets. Verse-writing at Rome began at a time when the tendency to shorten final vowels originally long had commenced, but had not nearly prevailed over the natural quantity. This

[1] Lachmann, l. c. "quo primo Maro usus est". Lucian Müller, p. 322, quotes a verse of Attius (*ap. Festum*, p. 146): "Calones famulique metallique caculaeque": but there are no instances in the remaining fragments of Ennius or Lucilius, nor in Lucretius, Catullus, or the remaining verses of Cicero.

state of things is most clearly discernible in Plautus: but it is sufficiently obvious even in the stricter measure of Ennius. Lucilius, as was natural, allowed himself, to a certain extent, a similar freedom; but the poets of the later republic, Catullus and Lucretius, became much stricter. Except in Greek endings like "despexit hymenaeos" &c. Catullus never lengthens a short final vowel, unless we are to count the much-emended line 100. 6 "Perfecta exigit*ur* unica amicitia", to which Mr Ellis apparently does not object. Two instances have been restored to Lucretius by Mr Munro: 2. 27 "Nec domus argento fulg*et* auroque renidet" and 5. 1049 "Quid vellet facere ut sci*ret* animoque videret": but even these were altered by Lachmann or with his approval, for they are solitary in his author. There is nothing of the kind in the fragments of Cicero's verses. Vergil deserted the strictness of his immediate predecessors, and recurred, to a certain extent, to the practice of Ennius[1]. It will be worth while to compare the usages of the two poets in detail.

(1) Lengthening of final syllables in *r*. (*a*) Nouns. Masculines in *or*. As far as I can ascertain there is no instance in the fragments of Ennius where this ending is short[2] either in arsis or thesis. Ennius writes not only:

"Postilla, germana sor*or*, errare videbar" (Ann. 42),

"O pater, O genit*or*, O sanguen Dis oriundum" (Ann. 117),

"Qui clam*or* oppugnantis vagore volanti" (Ann. 408),

"Tollitur in caelum clam*or* exortus utrimque" (Ann. 422),

"Imbricit*or* aquiloque suo cum flamine contra" (Ann. 424),

but also

"Clamor in caelum volvendus per aethera vagit" (Ann. 520),

[1] Horace is much freer than Catullus, as Vergil is than Lucretius. Except "Teucer et Sthenelus sciens" (1 C. 15. 24), which he altogether rejects, and "Si non periret immiserabilis" (3 C. 5. 17), and "Ignis Iliacas domos" (1 C. 15. 36), about which he has doubts, Mr Munro admits the rest of these scansions in Horace without hesitation. These amount to about ten: but it should be remarked that none of them occur in the fourth book of the Odes, the Epistles, or the Ars Poetica, in which Horace was writing at his best.

[2] So in Plautus, according to Fleckeisen (ap. C. F. W. Müller, *Plautinische Prosodie*, p. 42 foll.), it is exclusively long.

unless with Lachmann we follow the indication given by Quintilian[1] and read *clamos*. Compare with the lines of Ennius above quoted the following from Vergil:

"Omnia vincit Amor, et nos cedamus Amori" (E. 10. 69).
"Aequus uterque labor: aeque iuvenemque magistri" (G. 3. 118).
"Nam duo sunt genera, hic melior, insignis et ore" (G. 4. 92).
"Luctus, ubique pavor, et plurima mortis imago" (A. 2. 369).
"Et Capys, et Numitor, et qui te nomine reddet" (A. 6. 768).
"Considant, si tantus amor, et moenia condant" (A. 11. 323).
"Quippe dolor, omnis stetit imo volnere sanguis" (A. 12. 422).
"Et Messapus equum domitor, et fortis Asilas" (*ib.* 550).

Lucian Müller thinks the caesura sufficient to account for all these cases both in Ennius and Vergil, denies the possibility of *clamor* in thesis, and asserts that in the second part of the sixth century A.U.C. this syllable was mostly shortened. No case of such shortening, however, as has been seen, can be quoted from Ennius. Vergil, who was probably ignorant of the reason which made Ennius write as he did, viz. the original length of this syllable, which corresponds to the Greek -ωρ or -ων, and who only wished to give an antique flavour to his verse by suggesting such echoes of the Ennian hexameter, would never have dreamed of using the final *or* long except in arsis: but Müller can hardly be right in applying the same measure to both poets.

How purely a matter of form this licence was with Vergil will become apparent when we consider how far, and (from an etymological point of view) how unjustifiably, he pushes his employment of it. Ennius, using *iubar* masculine, could write

"Interea fugit albus iubar Hyperionis cursum" (A. 547),

but no grammatical propriety can be alleged for such scansions as

"Desine plura, puer, et quod nunc instat agamus" (Verg. E. 9. 66),
"Si quis ebur, aut mixta rubent ubi lilia multa" (A. 12. 68);

still less for

"Pingue super oleum infundens ardentibus extis" (A. 6. 254).

The lines

"Ostentans artemque pater arcumque sonantem" (A. 5. 521)

[1] 1. 4. 13. "*Arbos, labos, vapos* etiam et *clamos* aetatis fuerunt."

and "Congredior: fer sacra pat*er* et concipe foedus" (A. 12. 13) would seem to recall the original length of the final syllable of *pater:* but this had been forgotten as early as Ennius, who constantly uses it short.

(*b*) Inflections of verbs ending in *r*. Ennius writes

"Quirine Pater vener*or* Horamque Quirini" (Ann. 121),

in accordance with the natural length of the syllable and the analogy of Plautine usage: but Vergil, who has not imitated him in lengthening the last syllable of the first person sing. passive, has lengthened that of the third in the following instances:

"Altius ingredit*ur* et mollia crura reponit" (G. 3. 76).

"Tum sic Mercurium alloquit*ur*, et talia mandat" (A. 4. 222).

"Olli serva dat*ur*, operum haud ignara Minervae" (A. 5. 284).

This syllable is invariably short in Ennius, except in the very doubtful fragment "horitatur induperator" Ann. 350, nor is it often long in Plautus. The first person plural has its ending lengthened by Vergil A. 2. 411,

"Nostrorum obruim*ur*, oriturque miserrima caedes",

again without precedent in the fragments of Ennius.

(2) Lengthening of final syllables in *s*. (*a*) Nouns.

The last syllable of *sanguis* was originally long, and so is always used by Lucretius and once by Vergil. The length of the last syllable of *pulvis* in Ennius (Ann. 286),

"Iamque fere pulv*is* ad caelum vasta videtur",

and in Vergil (A. 1. 478),

"Per terram, et versa pulv*is* inscribitur hasta",

is not easy to account for. There is also some difficulty about such a scansion as *populūs* (Enn. Ann. 90),

"Iamque expectabat popul*us* atque ora tenebat";

followed by Vergil G. 3. 189, 4. 453, A. 5. 337:

"Invalid*us*, etiamque tremens, etiam inscius aevi":

"Non te nulli*us* exercent numinis irae":

"Emicat Euryal*us*, et munere victor amici".

This is a licence which is doubtful even in Plautus (Müller, Pl. Pr. p. 52), and it seems most probable that Ennius (and after him Vergil) was imitating the lengthening of the Greek ος of the second declension in such lines as Iliad 1. 153, 244,

Δεῦρο μαχησόμενος, ἐπεὶ οὔτι μοι αἴτιοί εἰσιν.
Χωόμενος, ὅτ' ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισας.

"Fatalisque man*us*, infensa Etruria Turno" (A. 12. 232)

and

"Sicubi magna Iov*is* antiquo robore quercus" (G. 3. 332)

may perhaps be considered an extension of this licence. So A. 3. 112 "Idaeumque nem*us*: hic fida silentia sacris".

Whether Ennius lengthened the dative plural in *-bus* cannot be ascertained, and such a scansion is infrequent in Plautus. But Vergil does not hesitate to write (A. 4. 64)

"Pectorib*us* inhians spirantia consulit exta".

(*b*) Verbs. The only case is "Terga fatigam*us* hasta" (A. 9. 610), a quantity for which no analogy can be proved in Ennius or Plautus.

(3) Endings in *t*. Third person singular of verbs. The *-at* of the indicative present 1st conjugation, though long by nature and frequently scanned accordingly in Plautus, is of variable quantity in Ennius, but mostly long.

Compare

"Solus avem serv*at*: at Romulus pulcher in alto" (Ann. 83),

"Inde sibi memor*at* unum superesse laborem" (Ann. 159),

"Quae nunc te coquit et vers*at* in pectore fixa" (Ann. 340),

"Tum timido man*at* ex omni pectore sudor" (Ann. 399),

with

"Missaque per pectus dum transit strider*ăt* hasta" (Ann. 365).

Vergil has no imitation of this.

-At of the imperfect is long in Plautus, and so in Ennius even in thesis, Ann. 314,

"Noenum rumores pone*bat* ante salutem":

but short Ann. 141,

"Volturus in spinis miserum mandeb*ăt* homonem".

So Vergil, (but only in [1]arsis) E. 1. 39, A. 5. 853, 7. 174, 10. 383, 12. 772.

"Tityrus hinc aber*at*: ipsae te, Tityre, pinus":

[1] It would be very rash with Fleckeisen and Ladewig to attribute to Vergil, on the sole authority of the Codex Romanus, such lines as "Cum clamore Gyas revocabat: ecce Cloanthum" (5. 187), or "Arduus, effractoque inlisit ossa cerebro" (5. 480).

"Nusquam amittebat, oculosque sub astra tenebat":
"Regibus omen erat: hoc illis curia, templum":
"Per medium qua spina dabat: hastamque receptat":
"Hic hasta Aeneae stabat: huc impetus illam".

-*Et* in the present and future indicative and imperfect subjunctive is long in Plautus and so in Ennius even in thesis, Ann. 86:

"Omnibus cura viris uter esset induperator":

in arsis, Ann. 100, 171, 349, 409:

"Nec pol homo quisquam faciet inpune animatus":
"Inicit imitatus: tenet occasus, iuvat res":
"Pugnandi fieret aut duri finis laboris":
" prandere iubet horiturque":

but *decĕt* Ann. 229:

"Nec me rem decet hanc carinantibus edere chartis".

Compare the cases from Lucretius quoted above and Vergil A. 1. 308, 651:

"Qui teneat, nam inculta videt, hominesne feraene";
"Pergama cum peteret inconcessosque hymenaeos".

-*It* of the present (3rd conjugation) is constantly short in Ennius, but long Ann. 123,

"Mensas constituit idemque ancilia"

(if this be the present), 346, 484,

"Sensit, voce sua nictit ululatque ibi acute":
"Multa foro ponit et agea longa repletur".

So occasionally in the comedians (C. F. W. Müller, p. 79). Vergil, E. 7. 23, A. 9. 9, 10. 433, has

"Versibus ille facit; aut si non possumus omnes":
"Sceptra Palatini sedemque petit Evandri":
"Tela manusque sinit. Hic Pallas instat et urget".

-*It* of the fourth conjugation is long in Ennius Ann. 258,

"Alter nare cupit, alter pugnare paratust"

(if *cupit* be from *cupire*).

Comp. Ann. 419

"*It* eques et plausu cava concutit ungula terram":

432 "Configunt parmam, tinnit hastilibus umbo":

386 (thesis) "Infit, O cives, quae me fortuna ferocem".

Vergil has no instances.

-It of the first future is short Enn. Ann. 153

"Hac noctu filo pendeb*it* Etruria tota",

and there is no instance in his fragments of its being lengthened. Vergil however has *erit* twice; E. 3. 97, A. 12. 883:

"Ipse ubi tempus *erit*, omnes in fonte lavabo":

"Te sine, frater, *erit?* O quae satis ima dehiscat".

-It of the present subjunctive and second future is long in Plautus: so also Ennius has *fuerīt* and *dederīt* Ann. 128, 165,

"Si quid me fuer*it* humanitus ut teneatis":

"At sese, sum quae deder*it* in luminis oras".

Compare *velīt* Ann. 200,

"Vosne vel*īt* an me regnare era quidve ferat Fors".

No instances in Vergil.

-It of the perfect indicative is often long in Plautus (references in Müller, Pl. Pr. p. 71), but Ennius, though he writes (Ann. 599)

"Qua murum fieri volu*it*, urgentur in unum",

makes it mostly short: a strange fact, as the original length of the vowel is unquestionable. The long scansion was afterwards taken up by Ovid in the case of words compounded with *eo* (subī*t* &c.), and Vergil writes (G. 2. 211, A. 8. 363)

"At rudis enitu*it* impulso vomere campus":

"Alcides subi*it*, haec illum regia cepit".

In A. 10. 394 Vergil extends this licence to lengthening the last syllable of *caput*. *Procūl* ("arcemque proc*ul* ac rara domorum" A. 8. 98) stands by itself.

It will be seen from the instances quoted that Vergil, though on the whole following the lines marked out by the early Roman poetry, never allows himself these licences except in arsis, and but seldom where there is not a slight break in the sentence[1]. By Ennius these limitations were far less rigorously observed. Vergil considered such scansions as antiquarian ornaments, and as such they were to a certain extent taken up from him by Ovid, Propertius, Tibullus and the later poets.

[1] Comp. Haupt on *Ov. Met.* 3. 184. "Ovid setzt kurze Silben statt langer in der Hebung vor griechischen Wörtern oder in der Cäsur des dritten Fusses vor *et* und *aut*." This remark would cover a great many, though by no means all, of the cases quoted from Vergil.

H. NETTLESHIP.

ÆNEAS' VOYAGE ROUND SICILY.

VERG. *Æn.* III. 687—706.

THE death of the lamented Professor Conington must awaken a fresh interest in the study of those authors which he called peculiarly his own. The third volume of his edition of Vergil is even now in the press, and the eagerness with which every Vergilian scholar will open the new work, will be sadly dashed by the thought that the pure and noble soul that dictated it is not here to listen to the praises which it will no doubt receive.

In venturing to criticise some of Professor Conington's past work on Vergil, it is assuredly from no wish to set up my own knowledge of the language or the author against his. The passage, however, named above as it appears in his translation was selected by more than one reviewer as particularly successful both in sound and sense. Now Conington himself has well spoken of Vergil's language as extremely sensitive; and this is precisely what his ballad metre is very often not. In this passage he, after Dryden, Pitt and Symonds, leaves out a variety of little words, which not only give the lines much of their life and point, but the omission of which conveys a positively false idea. His translation is thus:

When lo! from out Pelorus' strait
  The northern breezes blow!
We pass Pantagia's rocky gate,
And Megara, where vessels wait,
  And Thapsus, pillowed low.
Before Sicania's harbour deep
Against Plemyrium's billowy steep
  Ortygia's island lies.. ...and then,
Pass rich Helorus' stagnant fen.
Pachynus' lofty cliffs we graze,
  Projecting o'er the main,

And Camarina meets our gaze,
Which fate forbad to drain,
And Gela's fields, and Gela's wall,
And Gela's stream, that names them all.
High towering Acragas succeeds,
The sire one day of generous steeds:
Selinus' palms I leave behind
And Lilybeum's shallows blind.

Any one would suppose from these verses, that the same north wind took Æneas from Ætna to Pachynus, and from Pachynus to Lilybæum, and round to Drepanum; and that he saw all the towns and harbours named under the same circumstances. Impossible as this would be in an ancient ship, it would not trouble most Vergilian critics, who are fond of asserting that Vergil is entirely careless of such delicate points as the direction of the wind. Now I believe that Vergil has throughout this passage very accurately defined the wind throughout Æneas' course, and just how it would carry him along or off shore, by those very little words which Professor Conington leaves out—probably as injuring the run of his metre.

Let us consider exactly where Æneas is and how he must get round Sicily.

He is off the land of the Cyclopes, he has cut his cable and rowed till Polyphemus is out of his depth. Here he prepares to take the favorable wind (ventis intendere vela secundis, l. 683). This however being contrary to his orders, he is debating a return when the wind changes to the north by special divine aid. The course now is given thus :

Ecce autem Boreas angusta ab sede Pelori
Missus adest, vivo prætervehor ostia saxo
Pantagiæ Megarosque sinus Thapsumque jacentem.
Sicanio prætenta sinu jacet insula contra
Plemmyrium undosum, nomen dixere priores
Ortygiam * * * et inde
Exsupero præpingue solum stagnantis Helori.
Hinc altas cautes projectaque saxa Pachyni
Radimus, et fatis numquam concessa moveri
Apparet Camarina procul campique Geloi
Immanisque Gela fluvii cognomine dicta.
Arduus inde Acragas ostentat maxima longe
Mœnia, magnanimum quondam generator equorum.
Teque datis linquo ventis, palmosa Selinus,
Et vada dura lego saxis Lilybeia cæcis.

It is perhaps needless to say that Boreas with Vergil as with Herodotus and Strabo is the cold northern wind, so well known in Italy. Not always however due north, as those commentators seemed to think, who are puzzled on Æn IV. 442, to know how "Alpine Boreæ" could blow at once *hinc* and *illinc*. Vergil is there describing what he must have seen yearly at Andes, the winds coming down from the Alps and attacking the trees, now from one peak or gorge, now from another, now N.W., now N.E., but always Boreæ, in the northern quarter. Here Boreas is North—further defined as *angusta ab sede Pelori*. It carries Æneas rapidly along the shore—*prætervehit*—near enough to see Thapsus, although low—*jacentem*.

In fear of the well-known passage round *Plemmyrium undosum* (undosum = Πλημμύριον) he pays his vows to the Syracusan deities, and now runs nearer the coast, so as to force his way over the oozy estuary of Helorus, for this I believe is the

only meaning of *præpingue solum* consistent with Vergil's uniform use of *exsupero*, and then still closer, grazes the cliffs of Pachynus. He has now turned the corner, and let him sail as near to the wind as an ancient ship could, at the utmost seven points, the right-hand coast will always be farther and farther off. As he beats up, Camarina is *procul*—far off. The plains of Gela may be distinguished at the bottom of their bay, and so their city on account of its huge size—*immanis*,—but he does *not* say, as Professor Conington makes him, that he sees the river. Next is seen Agrigentum, from a distance—*longe*—beyond ordinary vision. But in a line filled with words implying vastness, he tells us that only its immense size and towering position made it visible. This is very nearly the last point on the coast which Æneas could reach by beating against a northern wind. His course lies to Lilybæum, the wind must change to serve him. Accordingly we find that he is enabled *datis ventis* to pass Selinus, run close to the Lilybæan shoals and enter Drepanum. Mr Conington, it will be observed, entirely leaves out in his translation any hint that Æneas ran nearer to one coast than the other, or that the wind even changed. If it be said that *datis* does not necessarily imply change, neither does it imply continuance; it does imply such a wind as he wanted, and that could not be the existing one.

Can any one say why Syracuse is not *named* in the above, when so many other towns are, founded long after the supposed date of the voyage?

W. EVERETT.

Oct. 1869.

ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF ST JOHN V. AND VI.

THE cardinal question which Gospel Chronologers have to answer is this:—does St John's narrative of the ministry imply *three* Passovers or *four?* Among modern commentators Greswell may be taken as the leading advocate of the "four Passovers" theory, and Wieseler of the "three Passovers" theory. As both sides admit the genuineness of John vi. 4 (*ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*), the question, as between these two, is commonly narrowed to this:—was the nameless feast of John v. 1 a Passover or not?

Greswell (in his 23rd Dissertation) proves to his own satisfaction that this nameless feast was a Passover (assuming that St John passes over a whole year in silence between his fifth and sixth chapters), and so makes out his case for four Passovers within the limits of the ministry.

To this hypothesis, which is the commonly received one,—besides the objection so lightly met by Greswell, that it supposes a whole year to be passed over in silence in St John's narrative,—there is surely a fatal objection in the fact that it interposes *eighteen months* between the Bethesda miracle, and our Lord's allusion to it, as to something quite fresh in the minds of his audience, in John vii. 21—23.

To avoid this, as well as for other reasons, Wieseler, followed by Tischendorf and Bishop Ellicott, adopts Kepler's suggestion that the nameless feast of John v. 1 was *Purim;* and thus shortens the period between the Bethesda cure, and the allusion to it in vii. 21, to seven months. The Passover of vi. 4 thus becomes the second instead of the third, and the ministry embraces in all *three* Passovers instead of four.

But there are several difficulties in the way of this theory.

1. Not only the Paris Codex, but the Sinaitic also, inserts the article before ἑορτή in John v. 1.

2. No one ever suggested Purim before Kepler. All the fathers assumed naturally that a feast which thus drew our Lord to Jerusalem must have been one of the three great feasts.

3. It is improbable that our Lord should have absented himself from Jerusalem at a Passover. This objection applies, of course, equally to the other theory.

4. Our Lord at this feast seems to allude (v. 35) to the Baptist as to one recently dead, and we have reason to believe that the Baptist was murdered just before the Passover[1] of this year.

5. The persecution of our Lord for allowing his disciples to rub the ears of corn seems to connect itself with this charge of Sabbath-breaking at the unnamed feast; and St Luke's careful date, ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ, difficult at best, is most plausibly explained by Scaliger to mean the first Sabbath after the great Morrow of the Passover, before which it was unlawful to gather ears of corn.

6. And there is a sixth and far greater difficulty, which must strike every one who glances over Wieseler's scheme (p. 280), or the harmony of Tischendorf founded upon it, viz. that all those events which in Greswell's scheme occupy a full year, including three tours through the towns of Galilee, and indeed nearly the whole of the great Galilæan ministry, have to be compressed into the brief space of three weeks between the feast of Purim March 26th and the Passover April 16.

This last difficulty seems to me, I confess, insuperable. No one can read Bishop Ellicott's 4th Lecture, occupying 50 octavo pages, without being almost painfully aware of the ingenuity required in order to bring such an extended narrative within the three weeks prescribed by his theory.

Besides all these difficulties, there is yet one other which,

[1] To Wieseler's quotations in favour of γενέσια meaning not the Birth-day but the Accession-day of Antipas, Plato 1, Alcib. c. 17 may be added.

so far as I am aware, has never received the attention to which it seems to me entitled, and to the consideration of which without further preface I will now proceed. To my own mind it has suggested *a third solution* of the question, which, though doubtless open to objection, may perhaps be thought worthy of further discussion.

The difficulty to which I allude lies in the *incoherency* of context in this portion of St John's Gospel.

In the fifth chapter we find Jesus attending a feast at Jerusalem, and *he is left there* at the end of the chapter in bitter controversy with the Jews. The sixth chapter begins, "After these things Jesus went over the sea of Galilee." Surely the inconsecutiveness must strike every one.

Again, the sixth chapter leaves Jesus in Capernaum; and yet the beginning of the seventh seems to imply a migration from Judea to Galilee, assigning as a reason for it the Jerusalem persecution narrated in the fifth chapter. Here is a second inconsecutiveness[1].

Then, proceeding with the seventh chapter, we find our Lord's discourse taking up the broken threads of the controversy of the fifth chapter, in a way that must make the most cursory reader surprised that the Evangelist should have allowed the whole of that long sixth chapter to intervene.

"Why go ye about to kill me?"

"I have done one work, and ye all marvel."

"Are ye angry with me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath-day?"

As one dwells on these inconsecutivenesses of the narrative as it now stands, one is almost forced into a wish to believe that the fifth and sixth chapters have got transposed.

Now let us transpose v. and vi. Read in this new order (iv, vi, v, vii) the coherency of context is at once seen to be perfect.

[1] A friend has pointed out to me that Cardinal Cajetan in his *Comment. in Joan.* seems to have felt this difficulty:—"quum verba in praecedente capite relata, Hierosolymis dicta appareant, * * * gesta haec quae subjunguntur non immediatè juncta fuerint cum gestis in praecedente capite."

At the end of the fourth chapter our Lord is at Capernaum; the next chapter (vi.) begins most naturally by telling us how he crossed the Lake. The sixth chapter leaves him at Capernaum, "the Passover the feast of the Jews" being "at hand." How naturally then does the fifth chapter follow:—*μετὰ ταῦτα ἦν [ἡ] ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, "after this was the feast" (to which he had just alluded as near at hand, not needing therefore to be again named), *καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.*

Again, the fifth chapter closes leaving our Lord at Jerusalem, but under sentence of death for Sabbath-breaking. Most naturally therefore does the seventh chapter open by telling us that Jesus resolved to walk no more in Jewry "because the Jews sought to kill him."

Every one, I think, who has accustomed himself for a while to read the chapters in this order will be unwilling lightly to relinquish it, if it be only for the sake of what I have called the naturalness of St John's narrative.

But when we find further that the whole scheme of Gospel Chronology is suddenly cleared up by it, that the difficulties which beset Greswell's scheme, and the difficulties which beset Wieseler's scheme, at once drop out, as it were, by the simple adoption of this inversion, its inherent probability is to say the least greatly increased.

Jerome's words (commenting on the Greek version of Isaiah xxix. 1) come to have a clear and distinct meaning: "Scriptum est in Evangelio secundum Joannem, per tria paschata Dominum venisse in Jerusalem, quæ duos annos efficiunt."—(Op. III. 245.) And a scheme of Johannine Chronology results with which the main point of the Synoptic Gospels can (with one notable exception[1]) be more easily harmonized than with any other.

But however much the wish may be "father to the thought,"

[1] The exceptional difficulty is the anecdote of the rubbing of the ears of corn, which according to this scheme must be placed *after* the feeding of the 5000. Its very early position in St Mark and St Luke must of course be an insuperable difficulty to one who adopts *their* order as his clue to the Gospel Chronology. But the difficulty of compressing all the intervening events into three weeks seems to me almost as great.

it must be relinquished in the absence of all documentary evidence of such inversion of these chapters.

Short of this, however, are there not some facts about the construction of this Gospel which render some dislocation of this sixth chapter not antecedently improbable?

Now in proceeding to this second question, it occurs to us at once that in the twenty-first chapter we have confessedly a postscript, written probably on a separate parchment, and subsequently to the completion of the Apostle's first draft of his gospel.

What if the sixth chapter were added at the same time? and also on a separate parchment? How easily, in that case, might it get inserted by very early copyists[1] in the wrong place!

Once in this train of thought, it is curious how many points of similarity, connecting together the sixth and the twenty-first chapters, occur to the mind.

1. Both chapters may be detached without in the least impairing the completeness of the Gospel narrative.

2. Both chapters, unlike the rest of the Gospel, are exclusively Galilæan,—anecdotes of the Galilæan Lake.

3. Both relate an unexpected apparition of Jesus after a night of toil.

4. Both relate a miracle followed by a quasi-sacramental meal. Compare *ἔλαβε τοὺς ἄρτους καὶ εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκε τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις· ὁμοίως καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀψαρίων*, of vi. 11, with *λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὸ ὀψάριον ὁμοίως*, of xxi. 13.

5. Both begin with the characteristic *μετὰ ταῦτα*.

6. Both end with a personal allusion to Simon Peter.

7. Both contain two words occurring nowhere else in the New Testament, *Τιβεριάς* for the Sea of Galilee, and *ὀψάριον* for fish.

[1] Irenæus read the narrative in the order in which we have it. Lib. II. cap. 22, § 3. Therefore the error must have been made, if at all, before his time. It is curious that in this passage he clearly supposes the Feast of v. 1, to be the Passover, and the miracle of the 5000 to have followed it *immediately* after on our Lord's return to Galilee, either ignoring vi. 4, or giving *ἐγγύς* a retrospective meaning.

8. Both are carefully dated (vi. 4, and xxi. 14), as would naturally be the case in supplemental anecdotes intended to be added to the original narrative. And thus a better reason is suggested for the insertion of vi. 4 than that commonly assigned —that it was merely to account for the multitudes.

On no one of these points taken singly can any stress be laid; but taken cumulatively they may perhaps be allowed weight as confirmatory of a hypothesis antecedently probable.

Its antecedent probability rests on the fact which all must, I think, allow, that the narrative of St John's Gospel gains most strikingly in coherency and natural consecutiveness, if we suppose that in the first draft the *seventh* chapter was written as the immediate sequel of the *fifth;* and that when the two supplemental chapters (vi. and xxi.) came to be added, one of them got inserted in the wrong place.

If this hypothesis be allowed, the Chronology of St John's Gospel is at once cleared of difficulty: the nameless feast of v. 1 is a passover, and is to be identified with the passover of vi. 4; and our Lord's ministry limited to two years and a quarter.

Since writing these notes, I have been interested to find that Ludolphus de Saxoniâ, whose *Vita Christi* was the great text-book of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, seems to take it for granted (without assigning any reason) that the sixth chapter of St John ought to precede the fifth. To those disciples of Ignatius Loyola, therefore, who are said to have drawn so largely in their preaching from the eloquent old Carthusian, the hypothesis here maintained would have seemed in no way strange.

Greswell mentions somewhere, I think, that Mr Mann, whose book, "*de annis Christi natali et emortuali*," is unknown to me, also inverts these chapters, in order to work out his theory of a one-year ministry.

I may be wrong, misled by allowing the notion to become a dominant idea in my mind for some years; but, so far as I am at present informed, the point seems to deserve further discussion.

J. P. NORRIS.

NOTE ON THE 'ARZARETH' of 4 Esdr. xiii. 45.

'Nam regio illa vocatur Arzareth.' This passage has apparently hitherto defied the ingenuity of commentators. From the MSS. and versions no help is to be obtained. The Latin MSS. of any value only vary between the reading *Arzareth* and *Arsareth;* the Syriac gives *Arzaph;* the Æthiopic has *Azaph:* Ockley from the Arabic translates *Acsarâri Kararâwin,* which is evidently an attempt at interpretation, and is first transformed by Gutschmid (in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* for 1860, p. 75) into Aqsarâî kozarâwîn, and then rendered as Turkish. But the Arabic text printed by Ewald has *Ascarâri Fararâwin.* The Armenian 'Αρσάρατα of Ptol. v. 12, is appealed to as possibly the *Arzareth* of Esdras (Gutschmid, p. 76). Volkmar (*Handb. d. Einl. in die Apokryphen,* 2 Abth. p. 193) conjectures that *Arzareth* = 'Αρζαράθ = (?ארט) ארץ ארת, *erets ărát,* 'the land of Arat or Ararat,' i.e. Northern Armenia. Le Hir (*Études Libliques,* i. 214, note) suggests that the first part of the word is the Hebrew הר, *har,* 'mountain,' and with the remainder 'Sareth' he compares 'Seres,' the name by which the Chinese were known to the ancients. Bretschneider conjectures ארץ רעע 'Land des Schreckens.'

On this point Dr Schiller-Szinessy writes to me as follows:

"Now let us simply give the words of the Mishnah *Synhedrin,* x. 3 (Talm. Bab. *Synh.* fol. 110 *b*), עשרת השבטים אינן עתידין לחזור שנאמר וישליכם אל ארץ אחרת כהיום

הזה מה היום הזה הולך ואינו חוזר אף הם הולכין ואינם חוזרים דר׳ע ר״א אומר מה היום מאפיל ומאיר אף עשרת השבטים שאפל להן כך עתיד להאיר להן.

However R. Eliezer may differ from R. 'Aquiba with respect to the fate of the ten tribes, both agree as to the application of Deut. xxix. 28 to them. Is not the *Arzareth* of our Apocrypha simply the ארץ אחרת (A. V. 'another land') of that passage, corrupted by an ignorant translator into a proper name?"

The conjecture has the double merit of ingenuity and simplicity, and will appear even more probable than it does at first sight if we refer to ver. 40, where the same phrase occurs, 'et translati sunt in *terram aliam*.'

[W. A. W.]

LUCRETIUS, BOOK VI.

In the last number of the Journal, pp. 219—228, Professor R. Ellis has given criticisms and explanations of various passages in the 6th book of Lucretius. As he has been kind enough in his discussion of many, indeed most of these, to refer to my edition, I offer the following remarks in the hope that they will assist in the illustration of our author. None of the passages discussed by Mr Ellis is here passed over: in order to be as brief as possible, I will sometimes assume a knowledge on the reader's part of the text of Lucretius and my edition.

48 49 are very corrupt in our Mss.: Lachmann's reading, as well as those of older editors, will I think be disallowed by all. Bernays makes the very improbable assumption of a lacuna both before and after 48; and then he leaves 48 still uncorrected. My own arrangement and emendation of these vss., of which I have given an elaborate explanation, I did think and still think very plausible. But Mr Ellis says: 'for *Ventorum exirtant, placentur omnia rursum*, I would read *Ventorum existant* (so Bernays) *placentur momina rursum*, which is sufficiently justified by 474, *Posse quoque e salso consurgere momine ponti*'. It is possible that Lucr. might have said *momina ventorum*, though elsewhere he only uses *momen* in the singular. But this reading renders Bernays' improbable assumption of a double lacuna necessary; and then the verse is quite disjointed; and in my opinion not so near the Ms. reading, as my correction is.

52. 'Munro makes *quae* ... the subject of *faciunt*. May it not be *homines* 'and when they humble their spirits through

fear of the gods'?'. But 'Depressosque premunt ad terram' follows; and surely something external must be the subject to this, not the men themselves.

68. Quae nisi respuis ex animo longeque remittis
dis indigna putare alienaque pacis eorum;

'now unless you drive from your mind with loathing all these things, and banish from you all belief in things degrading to the gods and inconsistent with their peace'. So I translated; and wrote this note: '*putare* is for an accus. subst.: see n. to I 418 *repetam pertexere* and 331: *indigna putare* is not a common construction, but Lach. illustrates it from Cic. de sen. 4 'quis coegit eos falsum putare' and Aen. VIII 522; Forc. also exemplifies it from Virgil and Terence'. As in the notes referred to I have given at least six instances of the infinitive used by Lucr. for an accus. subst. and more than twenty for his use of it as a subst. generally, I certainly never anticipated my explanation being called in question. Older editors had got to the same meaning by reading *putando* for *putare*. But Mr Ellis says: 'it seems to me that this is not the first impression the words convey; *dis indigna putare* with *quae* preceding must surely be 'think them unworthy of the gods'; to separate the two clauses looks like an after thought, occasioned by the difficulty of *longeque remittis*'. But *quae nisi* is simply *quod nisi haec*, the relative serving at once for a connecting particle and a demonstrative pronoun, as in almost every page of any good author; in Lucr. as often as in any. Next *remitto* with an infin. is very good Latin, though not Ciceronian. But then for *longe* you want *prorsum* or the like. Then *prorsum remittis putare* may mean 'quite refuse to believe that they are unworthy of the gods and inconsistent with their peace'. But this is just the contrary of what the poet means. Well then *indigna* must be for *digna*; *aliena* for *non aliena*; on which principle you might construe Cicero's *falsum putare* not 'to believe what is false,' but 'to believe that this is true'. But Mr Ellis goes on: 'I think that the negative idea in these two words led Lucr. into a construction more Greek than Latin. As in 399 *parcit in hostis* is, not 'refrains against his enemies,' but 'spares it to attack his enemies'—'. But I must

observe that 'neque parcit [telum] in hostis' is as genuine Latin as there is; and that to say a construction is more Greek than Latin is to say Lucr. could not have used it, who like his contemporaries wholly abstained from Greek constructions. "So *l. remittis putare dis indigna* is in effect *atque ita remittis ut putes dis indigna* and might be translated, as in similar repeated negatives in Greek, 'and remove far from you the thought that they are worthy of the gods and compatible with their peace.'" Yes, but that comes back to our old 'prorsum remittis dis digna putare et non aliena pacis eorum,' which is just what Lucr. does not say.

116. Mr Ellis' note on this passage comes to the question which he asks towards the end of it: 'is it not possible that *fit ut* is sometimes represented by *fit* alone?' My answer would be that for many years past I have looked on this as not possible; and that every editor from Pius downwards, excepting Wakefield and Forbiger, but including Lambinus and Lachmann, is of the same opinion. Wakefield it is true calls them 'editores temerarii et indocti'; but has nothing better to appeal to than his own foolish misapprehensions of other passages of Lucretius and the semibarbarous antiquarian Apuleius; and even him he does not care to put to any real test.

129. Tum perterricrepo sonitu dat missa fragorem. Lachmann after carefully considering the passage itself and the whole sequence of the poet's argument, as well as the passage from Isidorus' Origines, comes to the conclusion that *missa* cannot be right, as Lucr. means to say that this frightful hurtling noise is occasioned by the bursting of the cloud, not by the emission of the wind. After long trying in my own mind to defend *missa,* I unhesitatingly came to the conclusion that it is indefensible. Mr Ellis says that it 'makes very good sense'; but as he does not attempt to refute Lachmann's argument, all I have to say is that it does not make the sense which the context requires. For 'Saepe ita dat parvum sonitum' Mr Ellis reads 'Suppetat haud parvum ad sonitum', altering three words and inserting a fourth. Surely too after all this gives but a feeble sense. In a former number I proposed *torvum* for *parvum,* which appears to me to give to the passage everything it

wants, the alteration too being exceedingly slight, as in our archetype T and P must have readily interchanged: its first blunder is *tergis* for *pergis*. I would compare too in 237 *tellens*, for which I read *pellens*. And with reference to this I will for convenience take here out of its order Mr Ellis' note on

563. '*Inclinata minent* is retained by Lambinus and I think rightly; it recurs perhaps in 1195 *frons tenta mebat*, i.e. *minebat*'. But, as I have there shewn, Heinsius and Lach. have independently made the *certain* correction 'frons ten*ta tu*mebat', 'the brow tense and swollen', which admirably suits the sense: the *tu* being omitted by perhaps the commonest of all errors in good Mss. My own correction of 563 'Inclina*ta tu*ment I look upon as almost equally convincing. For 'minent' is no Latin word, because 'inminent, eminent, prominent' are Latin, any more than 'cumbunt' is Latin, because 'incumbunt, procumbunt' are. The same may be said of many other compounds, where the simple verb is simply non-existent. But this which I thought was now universally admitted is not Mr Ellis' theory; for he says: 'for the same reason I would change *tellens* in 237 to *cellens*, as Wakefield, rather than *pellens* Munro, or *pollens* Lachmann'. Why 'for the same reason'? because the word is non-existent? surely not a satisfactory reason for accepting a mere conjecture of Wakefield; though the only reason I fear to be given for many of his conjectures. Then if *cellens* existed, not in Lucretius' *rerum natura*, but in *rerum natura* at all, why should it have the sense which is required here, and is exactly given by my *pellens*? For in my edition I unfortunately omitted to quote Pliny, XIV § 136, 'Campaniae nobilissima [vina] *exposita sub diu in cadis verberari* sole, imbre, ventis, aptissimum videtur': to a custom of this kind Lucretius I doubt not here refers.

154. If Mr Ellis will examine the context, he will see that what the poet emphasises is not the burning, but the noise made in burning; that therefore this emphasis is better given by my 'burns with a more startling sound', than by his 'burns more decidedly': comp. especially 149 and 151. I quite agree with him that *magis* belongs to the whole sentence.

258. For 'et fertus' of Mss. Lach. gives the simple and

certain correction 'effertus': older editors 'et fertur': it is possible that Lucr. wrote 'ecfertus' or even 'exfertus' on the analogy of *exfociant* (effugiant), which is the only case in which *ex* precedes *f* in the Corpus Inscr. Lat. vol. 1. Had our best Mss. been of the 14th or 15th century, I should have preferred *ecfertus*, as more likely then to be changed to *et fertus*. But that is not the case with Mss. of the 9th and 10th centuries. But Mr Ellis writes: '*et fertur*, which it is the custom at present to write as *ecfertur*, is supported by so very large a number of similar instances, as to make it probable that before *f* as before *g* [a misprint for *q*] a *t*, not a *c*, was the dominant spelling and pronunciation. So in Catullus, VI 13, *etfututa*, XXXVIII 6, *etquidnam*, and in X 8, *etquonam* may be the right reading, rather than *et quonam*.' I have much difficulty here in catching Mr Ellis' thought, or at all events the connexion of his thought. Does Mr Ellis mean to say that he can produce anything like an authority for maintaining that *ex* ever became *et* before *f* or *q* or any letter of the alphabet? There would be at least as good authority for saying *cetera* should be *tetera*, or *cumulos* should be *tumulos*, the occasional errors of Mss. even of a good age. Of course when you come to Mss. of the age of those of Catullus, you will find a strange word like *ecfututa*, *effututa* or *exfututa* written for instance *et futura*, but the *r* has just as much authority as the *t*, that is none at all. Similarly you will find *ecquidnam* written *et quid nam*, and I was going to say *ecquonam* written *et quoniam* or *quonam*; but I see Mr Ellis reads *et quonam*. Such spellings have scarcely the weight of a schoolboy's scribblings. But is there here some mystery I cannot penetrate? Twice in his Catullus he prints *provintia*: from his own and Schwabe's critical notes I should gather this was a mere misprint; but it occurs in both the places where the word is found.

285 286. Lucr. has just been describing one of the many ways in which the lightning-flash is produced, followed by the thunder-clap:

> Quem gravis insequitur sonitus, displosa repente
> opprimere ut caeli videantur templa superne.

To give sense here Lach. reads *exprimere*, Bernays *occidere*,

for *opprimere*. Instead of changing the genuine-looking *opprimere*, I made what I still think an almost certain correction, *videatur* for *videantur*, a very slight change, the scribe having as so often adapted the verb to the adjacent plural: in 467 the Mss. give *videatur* for *videantur*: 'close upon it follows so heavy a clap that it seems to crush down from above the quarters of heaven which have all at once sprung asunder': in my note I refer back to a former note in which I give several parallel instances from Lucr. and one from Terence: 'At quem deum! qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit', which Lucr. imitates in II 1100. The whole point of our passage is that the clap is so loud, it seems to bring down the sky on our heads. But Mr Ellis says on all this '*videantur* which is retained by Lach. need not be changed to *videatur* as Munro'. Yes, but Lach. kept it in order to make a much less probable correction, as he saw plainly the passage required essentially the sense I have given. 'Here the subject to *videantur* seems to be *lumina*'. Any plural in the preceding paragraph might just as well be chosen for the subject as *lumina*. With respect to I 1108 to which I refer in my note, Mr Ellis goes back to the old explanation without a word as to what Lach. says against it. To me *omnes* 'all men', in that passage seems as absurd as 'all flies', 'all sheep', 'all mice', or any other living thing you like.

296. I feel no doubt of Bernays' correction "calidam maturo fulmine', which I hit upon quite independently of him, being right: the Ms. reading, even after Mr Ellis' explanation, seems to me to be neither Latin nor sense.

370. At all events the insertion of *res*, so often omitted in our Mss., is critically as easy as that of *sese* for *se*; and to say the least makes the construction more easy and natural.

428. 'roused' or 'stirred' were chosen by me as more poetical than, and yet almost the same in meaning as "set in motion".

475. It is just possible that *omnibus* might have the sense which Mr Ellis gives to *omnis*, but which *omnis* cannot have. I feel little or no doubt that *ollis* is necessary.

483. *illi* could not possibly refer to *halitus* which occurs five lines before and is given as a mere illustration.

490. Tam magnis montis tempestas atque tenebrae
coperiant maria ac terras.

Lach. reads *nimbis* for *montis*, which I followed while avowing its great uncertainty. Since then it has struck me that perhaps Lucr. ventured to write 'Montibu' tam magnis'; as transposition of words is common in all Mss. and *montibus*, once transposed, would naturally be changed to *montis*. But Mr Ellis reads 'Tam magni montis cet.' and says this is so natural and Lucretian..as to make any alteration unnecessary. Yet he has made an alteration, as great perhaps as Lachmann's or mine; and whether he means *magni montis* for a genit. sing. or a nom. plur. I cannot say. But I do say that in neither case is it Lucretian Latin or Latin of any age.

548—551. Mr Ellis comments on these corrupt lines; he recals the *plaustris* of Mss. and old editions; but as he has not said a syllable against Lachmann's reasons, to me conclusive, for reading *plaustri*, of course I cannot follow him. In 550 I have argued against Lachmann's insertion of *et* as perverting the argument: Mr Ellis inserts this *et*. Here too of course I cannot follow him. His reading too requires *cumque* to stand independently. Here too I cannot follow him, as the impossibility of this is to my mind a demonstrated fact, if aught in philology and grammar can be said to be demonstrated. If ten thousand instances one way are to be overborne by one isolated passage in Horace, then reasoning must be at an end.

568. Quod nisi respirent venti: 570 Nunc quia respirant: 'In both places Munro translates 'abate their blowing'... Yet it may be doubted whether *respirare* can mean a pure negative; it seems rather to convey the double idea 'to blow and lull'. But in the first place I know no authority for the meaning Mr Ellis gives to the word; and in support of mine I offer these two exact parallels from Cicero: pro Quinct. 53 'si mehercule haec tecum duo verba fecisses, *quid ago?*, respirasset cupiditas atque avaritia paulum': Phil. VIII 20 'ne punctum quidem temporis, cum legati adessent, oppugnatio respiravit.' I very deliberately chose the expression 'abate their blowing', because I felt that Lucr. in his love of picturesque antithesis was uniting the literal and metaphorical meanings of the word.

573. inclinatur enim retroque recellit
et recipit prolapsa suas in pondere sedes.

As Mr Ellis quotes me here against myself, I must in justice quote myself in defence of myself. In this passage, if anywhere, I thought I had done something. I shewed that *pondere*, not *pondera*, was the reading of our archetype: I observed '*prolapsa* answers to *inclinatur*, *recipit sedes in pondere* to *retro recellit*: falling forward out of its place is the natural force of *prolapsa*: see Forc. and comp. 1006: *recipit sedes in pondere* then is a proper expression, not *prolapsa in pondera*: a thing *prolabitur trans pondera*, tumbles beyond its balance or centre of gravity: thus Livy etc.' Then, in answer to Turnebus and Lach. who asserted that only the plur. *pondera* had this meaning, I ransacked the language to prove the contrary, and to every instance they gave of *pondera*, I adduced a closely parallel example of *pondus* in the same sense. Not to be needlessly prolix, I kept back many other instances, some of which I have given in my note to Ætna 324. The passage I thus translated: 'it leans over and then sways back again, and after tumbling forward recovers in equal poise its fixed position'. Mr Ellis after quoting my note asks 'granting that *prolapsa* has this meaning, why should this necessitate *pondere*? *recipit sedes in pondere* seems to me slightly unnatural, *in pondera* not so'. But I must repeat once more that *pondere* is the real reading of Mss.: *pondera* is the conjecture. Then *pondus* is almost or quite synonymous with *suas sedes*, as in Lucan's 'mutataque sidera pondus Quaesivere suum'; so that with *pondera* the meaning would be 'brings back its state of stable equilibrium into its state of stable equilibrium'; whereas my reading gives this sense: 'recipit pondus suum et manet in pondere suo', the sense which Lucr. intended beyond question.

600. '*Idque* is perhaps right.. "the void it has made"': so Wakefield 'nempe id quod hiatu fecerit'. But Mr Ellis will find Wakefield and his followers alone to support him: '*idque* solus Wakefieldus se intellegere professus est' says Lach.

624. Mr Ellis here defends the second *venti*, which Wakefield calls a 'iucundissima repetitio'; Lach. 'inanis et sine pondere repetitio'. Here too I side with the latter.

663. No doubt *morbi* may be argued for here, as is done by Mr Ellis and by Wakefield before him. But I have long come to the conclusion that it is not really defensible.

715. Aut quia sunt aestate aquilones ostia contra,
anni tempore eo qui etesiae esse feruntur.

These two lines Mr Ellis compares with 729—731, and says the two passages seem so parallel as to explain each other. This parallel and his singularly forced explanation of 716 he will surely withdraw, when I point out to him that he has utterly misapprehended the construction of 716. The two vss. mean simply this: 'because in summer there are north winds opposite its mouths, which [north winds] at that time of year go by the name of etesian winds'. So simple seemed to me the passage, that I did not think it necessary to illustrate it, as I might have done from twenty Greek and Latin authors, who repeat again and again that etesian winds was the name given to the *aquilones* (*Βορέαι*) during a portion of the summer months. In 730 I feel not the smallest doubt that *quod* must be written for *quo*.

743. That the words in the sense given to them by Mr Ellis are Latin, I cannot believe. But if they admitted in themselves of this sense, the very next line would be in flat contradiction to it. And if this were not so, surely all our poetical associations would protest against it, Aeschylus' *πτερύγων ἐρετμοῖσιν ἐρεσσόμενοι*, Virgil's *remigium alarum* and *remigio alarum*, plain imitations of Lucretius; Ovid's *remigium volucrum pinnas*.

799—805. Mr Ellis quotes the whole of these vss. and makes two conjectures: one in 800 where he proposes *e flustris* for *effueris*. This is a passage of the kind in which certainty is unattainable. But whether *e flustris* can signify 'after being on the sea' or whether the effect of the inhaled brine followed by a hearty meal be to produce fainting fits, all this is to me dark as an oracle. I have always found in my own case that the inhaled brine was invigorating, 'Cum mare versamur propter', and had fancied it was so to the Romans as well.

His other conjecture is in 804 where for the corrupt *fervida servis* he proposes *fervida sorbus* which would be, he says,

'branches of boiling service-berries'. 'Service-berries of which Pliny mentions four kinds, three of them vinous in flavour . . were actually made into a kind of wine (Plin. XIV 16).' Yes, Pliny there, § 103, mentions that wine was made out of the *sorba* or fruit of the service tree, as out of *mala* of all kinds, *corna, mora, nuclei pinei,* etc. etc. But *sorbus* is a service-tree, and anything more strange than the notion of boiling a service-tree, a tree of large size, or even 'branches' of one, I cannot conceive. Fancy a *fervida malus* or a *fervida pinus,* or even what would be less odd, *fervida vitis*: a boiling apple-tree, pear-tree, pine-tree, even vine.

But though this will never do, it gives me an opportunity of recurring to this corrupt v. 'At cum membra domnus percepit fervida servis'; as it strikes me the *domnus* would be a confirmation of what I proposed 'At cum membra domus percepit fervidus, nervis Tum fit odor cet.': the *n* of *nervis* was omitted and then written over the line and got afterwards attached to *domus* instead of *nervis.* Comp. too Horace Sat. II 4 51 'Massica si caelo supponas vina sereno, Nocturna, si quid crassi est, tenuabitur aura Et decedet *odor nervis* inimicus.' This perhaps would tend to defend *vini,* which I said in my edition might be right; though I still think *viri* true.

851. Mr Ellis defends *partim,* apparently much as Wakefield does; but to me the word conveys no meaning: I cannot but echo Lachmann's 'Lambinus rectissime *raptim*': the change is next to nothing.

951—958. Mr Ellis quotes the whole of this difficult passage: on 954 he says *Galli lorica* 'the Gaulish cuirass' is a rather forced expression. But he has failed to observe that this is the technical prose term for a steel cuirass, used by Varro in his description of it quoted by Lachmann and by me: the proper meaning of *lorica* being a leathern cuirass. *Galli lorica* I look on as a quite certain correction of Lachmann: the *qua* gives sufficiently the object of *coercet.* But says Mr Ellis 'it seems to me that *caeli lorica* may possibly mean "the enclosing sky", something like Spenser's baldrick of the heavens bright'. But surely Spenser means simply the belt of the zodiac; no enclosing sky, but Varro's 'limbus Bis sex signis stellimicanti-

bus Aptus in obliquo aethere.' Then Mr Ellis for *qua* would read *aquam*. But here and in the passage he cites, 1103, 'caeli novitate et aquarum Temptari', 'where Lucr. perhaps hints at the combined effect of air and water in producing disease', I cannot help saying that, if I comprehend Lucr. at all, Mr Ellis has quite failed in catching his meaning, where he is speaking of the water. He simply refers in 1103 to the water used for drinking, which in real truth has much to do with epidemics. And here I will take the note on 1126 'Aut in aquas cadit aut fruges persidit in ipsas': 'i. e. indirectly into the waters which breed pestilence, or directly into and immediately upon the corn'. But in fact it falls more directly on the water which at once is used in drinking, than on the corn which before it is used has to be turned into meal and then into bread. Surely I have sufficiently in my edition explained *ipsas*.

Next, though it is quite impossible that Mr Ellis can be right in making a singular ablative absolute in 956 turn into a nomin. plural in 957, I will take this opportunity of saying that, though I feel convinced the general sense given to the passage in my edition is right, I can correct it now with less violence: I simply transpose 955 and 956, adopting Lachmann's reading of 956:

> Et, tempestate in terra caeloque coorta,
> Morbida visque simul cum extrinsecus insinuatur,
> In caelum terrasque remotae iura facessunt:

i. e. cum tempestas in terra caeloque coorta est et simul cum ea tempestate morbida vis extrinsecus insinuatur, haec tempestas et haec vis, in caelum terrasque remotae, iura facessunt. For when Mr Ellis speaks of *iurae* for *iure*, he takes no notice of the fact that in my earlier editions I too read *iure*; but in my last said that no satisfactory example could be found of *facesso*, 'to go away', except when an imperative or quasi-imperative, and therefore reluctantly returned to *iura*. I have copied down 12 examples of *facesso*, *facessit*, or *facessunt* with this neuter sense in Apuleius. But he, a mere ape of the old writers, seems to have generalised from the instances of the imperative which he found in them. When attention has been

pointedly drawn to a matter like this, it ought not to be passed over without notice.

958. '*raro corpore nexum*' says Mr Ellis 'is in effect a more poetical form of *raro corpori nexu* etc.': Lach. had said 'haec absurda sunt: nullum est enim rarum corpus quo res inter se coniunguntur. immo res ipsae raro corpore sunt, sive, quod idem est, *raro corpori' nexu':* and I beg to side with Lach.

971. First as to *ambrosias:* which Mr Ellis says is the Greek genitive, 'though Lach. denies this because Lucr. elsewhere writes *harmoniam harmoniai;* an inadequate reason, and one which would banish every individual peculiarity of grammar or construction'. Had Mr Ellis known that 'vir paucorum verborum' better, he would have seen that he meant much more than this; that he meant something like the following: '*ambrosias* might be taken for the Greek genitive; but I think this can hardly be; for long before Lucretius' time, when they adopted such Greek words, classical writers regularly gave them their own genitive: *musae, musai,* not *muses*; though later writers say *nymphe, nymphes* and the like. Lucr. himself has *harmoniai.*' Take this v. made almost wholly up of Greek words:

Et cycnea mele Phoebeaque daedala chordis:

we are sure that Lucr. used the Greek form *mele*; but feel no less sure that the Latin form *chordis* is his: *chordais* certainly we should reject. But be this as it may, leaving the form uncertain, I come to Mr Ellis' reading of 971:

Effluat ambrosias quasi vero e nectare tinctus:

'as if it were an offset tinctured with the true nectar of ambrosia whence it is drawn': 'because the tree is supposed to be dipt in ambrosia and then drawn out'. But how can *effluat* signify 'to be an offset'? and how can *tinctus e nectare* mean 'tinctured with nectar whence it is drawn'? and how is this less prosaic than 'the prosaic' *linctus,* which assuredly will not 'recede' before this? But this gives me an occasion of mentioning my own latest surmise: can *effluat* be said of the oleaster itself instead of the ambrosia and nectar coming from it? comp. Persius III 20 'effluis amens'; and see Jahn there and his

quotation from Claudian; and comp. the double use of *mano* in many writers, where it is applied to the object out of which a fluid comes as well as to the fluid itself. In that case I would propose:

Effluat ambrosius quasi vero et nectare tinctus.

972. Lach. reads *esca*, in my judgment a certain correction: Mr Ellis would have *escae*, not so near the Ms. reading, and of more than doubtful Latinity; for then we ought to have *quo* not *qua*.

1069. Lach. reads *uno* for *una*: this I adopted, as the change is exceedingly slight and the passage thus gains in symmetry and agrees better with the context. I added in my critical note however the words: '*uno* is not certain'. This seems to me pretty much what Mr Ellis says here, though in more words. *Compages* I have not the least doubt is the accusative; and *vincla* the nominative.

1119 1120. Mr Ellis quotes my translation and says: 'it is more natural to make *commovet* do double duty, 'ubi caelum se commovet, quod nobis forte alienum (se commovet), a constr. in the manner of Thucydides'. It seems to me much less natural, and, if it is in the manner of Thucydides, that is least of all a reason why it should be in the manner of Lucr. who writes plain Latin, not involved Greek.

1135. Mr Ellis says 'for *corrumptum* perhaps *coruscum*; bright after gloom or brighter than is natural to the climate'. This I fail to apprehend: a strange atmosphere comes, say from Egypt to Athens, which by being breathed engenders disease. But the sun of Egypt does not travel with it: it is bright or gloomy, as the climate into which it comes is bright or gloomy.

1199. Mr Ellis thinks *ut est* may be right: but the *ut est* of 1167, which he compares, is quite different. 'The corresponding ὡς ἐνδέχεται may well have been in his mind, while writing of the Athenian plague.' I do not catch the connexion of ὡς ἐνδέχεται with *ut est* or the Athenian plague. The Greek is equivalent to 'ut licet', 'ut fieri potest', or the like. But in Lucr. *est* cannot stand for *licet*, as in later writers. And, as Lach. remarks, at least it should be *ut erat*.

H. A. J. MUNRO.

A THEORY OF JOB XIX. 25—27.

THE following extract from the Authorized Version contains the passage to be discussed, together with a portion of the context which will be seen to have an important bearing on the argument:—

xix. 20 My bone cleaveth to my skin and to my flesh, and I
21 am escaped with the skin of my teeth. Have pity upon me,
have pity upon me, O ye my friends; for the hand of God
22 hath touched me. Why do ye persecute me as God[1], and are
23 not satisfied with my flesh? Oh that my words[2] were now
24 written! Oh that they were printed in a book! That they
were graven with an iron pen and lead[3] in the rock for ever!
25 For I know *that* my redeemer liveth, and *that* he shall
26 stand at the latter *day* upon the earth: and *though* after
my skin *worms* destroy this *body*, yet in my flesh shall
27 I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes
shall behold, and not another; *though* my reins be con-
28 sumed within me. But ye should say, Why persecute we
29 him[4]? seeing the root of the matter is found in me. Be ye
afraid of the sword: for wrath *bringeth* the punishments of
the sword, that ye may know *there is* a judgment.

In ver. 26 it appears from the italics that the words *though, worms, body* are interpolations and do not correspond

[1] Or simply, "thus"—כמו־אל for כמו־אלה, which occurs in Chap. xii. 3. But the rendering in the text is usually preferred.

[2] Some hereby understand the declaration in ver. 25 sq.: others, his "fortwährenden Betheuerungen seiner Unschuld" (*Dillmann*).

[3] The letters being cut in the rock, and the lead then infused (*Rashi*).

[4] "For ye say, *How will we persecute him!* whereas..." (*Ewald, &c.*).

directly to anything in the Hebrew. The translations which will next be given are professedly literal, and they express the three views most generally received, *viz.* that Job expected, (*a*) a Resurrection of the Flesh; (*b*) Immortality, or an Incorporeal Future life; or (*c*) Restitution or Vindication in the present life.

A. *Resurrection of the Flesh.*

This view is maintained by Dr Pusey in his *Daniel the Prophet*, p. 508. ed. 2:

"The great passage in the book of Job is a confession intended for all times:

O that my words were written, O that they were graven in a book, were cut with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever!

Their most literal translation is;

And I, I know that my Redeemer liveth;
And that, the last, He shall arise upon the dust;
And, after my skin, they have destroyed this *body*,
And from my flesh I shall behold God,
Whom I, I shall behold for myself,
And mine eyes shall behold, and not another [*lit.* a stranger,]
My reins are consumed within me.

No doubtful meaning of any words can efface from the passage the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh."

B. *Incorporeal Future Life.*

In a note upon the words "*with the eyes of his flesh*," Dr Pusey then proceeds to controvert the view adopted by Ewald and expressed with some variations in the words of Conant:

But I, I know my Redeemer lives,
And in after time will stand upon the earth;
And after this my skin is destroyed,
And without my flesh, SHALL I SEE GOD;
Whom I, for myself shall see,

And my eyes behold[1], and not another,
When my reins are consumed within me.

"That the language (continues Conant) here refers to an existence beyond the grave is asserted by the latest and best interpreters. Ewald, in many respects the ablest of the recent translators and interpreters of the book, regards this as undeniable; and the view which restricts the language to an *earthly hope*, is opposed to the proper force of the words, to the connection of thought, and to the spirit and tenor of the whole book." Cocceius, Vaihinger and Schlottmann are referred to in corroboration of this second view.

C. *Restitution* [or Vindication] *in the Present Life.*

Mr J. J. S. Perowne, in the Appendix to his Hulsean Lectures, states the third view, which limits Job's anticipation to the life present, and in support thereof refers to Bernard (ed. Chance) and Hävernick.

"I would render the passage as follows:

I, even I, know that my Redeemer liveth,
And that at the last He shall stand upon the earth (*lit.* dust);
And after my skin has been thus pierced through,
Yet from my flesh[2], I shall behold God,
Whom *I* shall behold *for myself*,
And mine eyes shall behold and not a stranger's.
My reins are consumed within me.

[1] This strong expression recurs in Job xlii. 5, and there it is not literal, nor does it refer to a future life:—"I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear: but now *mine eye seeth* Thee." Cp. xxxiii. 24—26. In Exod. xxiv. 10, 11, *seeing God* does not refer to life beyond the grave:—"also they saw God, and did eat and drink."

[2] Of those who limit Job's anticipations to this world some, as Hävernick, here adopt the form B, and make Job assert his confidence that though reduced to a mere skeleton, without skin or flesh (xxxiii. 21), he should yet behold God. Umbreit formerly held this view, but has since adopted B as a whole. Rosenmüller in his second edition maintains A. Bishop Warburton is conspicuous as a defender of C. Delitzsch adapts the form B to the theory A, laying stress on the expression ועיני ראו. But compare note 1.

The last line probably alludes to Job's longing for the time when God shall appear to maintain his cause against his friends, and to make his innocence clear.....The close of the book, where Job is recompensed *in this life* for all his losses and all his calamities, comports best with the obvious meaning of his words in the passage under consideration, that he hopes in this life, in the body, in his flesh which he now wears, to see God face to face, as his righteous Avenger, maintaining his cause, and putting his adversaries to confusion."

Remarks on the foregoing interpretations.

The rendering A is non-literal in respect of the word *body*, which is not expressed in the Hebrew. Some indeed think that the "this" refers to the *body*, to which Job may be supposed to point; but others read "thus," or refer "this" to the "skin" alone[1]. Perhaps the following *a priori* argument may tend to a solution of the difficulty. The first hemistich, in ver. 26, refers to the SKIN, and the second to the FLESH. Now according to all precedent, "skin" and "flesh," *occurring thus together*[2] should be conceived of as parts of one whole. In the context of this very passage they are so used: "My bone cleaveth to my *skin* and to my *flesh*" (ver. 20). We are led then *a priori* to assume from the parallelism that the *skin* and *flesh* spoken of are parts of one and the same body, instead of referring the former to the mortal body and the latter to the resurrection-body. Consider the following alternatives.

(i) If the word *body* be wrongly interpolated, we have in the first hemistich a reference to the destruction of the skin alone, while in the second something is predicated of the flesh alone. But it would be unnatural in English to say in the sense required by the *Resurrection* theory: "when my skin is destroyed, I shall see God in my flesh;" and in Hebrew the difficulty is precisely similar. We should be driven then to refer *skin* and *flesh* alike to the mortal body, there being no reasonable doubt about the reference in the former of these two words.

[1] Others supply, "shall be"—"After &c. *then* this *shall be*." The Chaldee has תהי דא.

[2] For "skin" alone see xviii. 13.

(ii) If the word *body* be rightly inserted, it still does not follow that its reference is to be restricted to the first hemistich; but it is on the contrary *a priori* probable, both from the parallelism and from usage elsewhere, that the said "body" would include the "skin" of the first hemistich and the "flesh" of the second as its component parts.

In B the parallelism is preserved, the verse in question being taken as descriptive of a vision of God to be enjoyed spiritually when flesh as well as skin should have been destroyed; but it is not certain that the rendering "*without* my flesh" is in accordance with Hebrew usage. The renderings of A, B and C, as regards this particular, may be included in the one expression, "OUT OF my flesh[1];" this being taken to imply in the one case that, I, being in my flesh, shall look out therefrom and see God;" and in the second case that, "I being out of my flesh, shall see God." The former is no doubt a possible meaning, but it is doubtful whether the second is admissible.

In C the more natural of these meanings is adopted, and the parallelism is at the same time preserved, both "flesh" and "skin" being referred to the same (mortal) body; but if Job is expressing his assurance of restitution in this life, it is not quite obvious how to account for his intense anxiety that his words might be written[2], and graven in the rock for ever, (ver. 23, 24). Moreover the argument from the ending of the book is not improbably fallacious, for it does not appear that Job was really expecting such a vision of God as is there described. Does it not rather *take him by surprise*[3]? If so we must reconsider our conclusion.

[1] Given in the A. V. margin.

[2] But this objection disappears when by those "words" we understand his former assertions of his innocence, and take ואני וגו׳ antithetically: "Yet I know, &c." The meaning would then be: "Yet I shall be satisfied without their being placed on record, for I know that I shall be vindicated openly." It still remains, however, that the use of אחרון יקום is unfavourable to C. יקום is used naturally of a successor, as in Deut. xxix. 21; Dan. vii. 24. For כתב in connexion with אחרון see Isai. xxx. 8; Ps. cii. 19, תכתב זאת לדר אחרון. On ואני see Dillmann.

[3] In the sequel, "the LORD answered Job out of the whirlwind" (xxxviii. 1; xl. 6). From the marked correspondence of ועתה עיני ראתך (xlii. 5) with ועיני ראו (xix. 27) we may infer that the aspirations in xix. 25—27 were then satisfied; but against the notion that Job was *expecting* that satisfac-

As regards an expression in ver. 27, A, B and C, may perhaps be described as alike inadequate. Some have felt so unsatisfied with the rendering, "my eyes shall behold, and *not another*," that they have had recourse to such a rendering as: "whom I shall see *on my side*... and not *as an enemy*[1]"—a fact which may be accepted as testifying to an apparent want of point, or rather to an *inappropriateness* of emphasis, in the expression "not another." Surely, from the general tenour of the book, we might expect the direct opposite: "whom I, *yea and others too*, shall see," for Job is anxious from first to last to be vindicated in the eyes of others, and the predicted vision of God is connected, this way or that, with his vindication. I shall in the sequel propose a translation which will obviate this difficulty and at the same time do away with the apparent disjointedness and want of connexion which the usual renderings of ver. 27, exhibit[2]. This translation is opposed however, as will be seen, to all of the foregoing theories, and favours that which I proceed to notice briefly before entering upon the discussion of the original Hebrew.

D. *Vindication*[3] *after Death.*

There is something to be said[4] for the theory that Job is simply looking for a vindication after death, without reference to a permanence or renewal of vitality. The supposed strong assertion in the verse last mentioned would seem indeed to be fatal to this theory; but all appearance of assertion disappears

tion are the expressions of disappointment, לא אחזו (xxiii. 9); לא חזו ימיו (xxiv. 1); לא תשורנו (xxv. 14). He does not expect recovery: see xvi. 22; xvii. 15; xxx. 23; *et passim.* In xxxiii. 25, 26 Elihu encourages him as one that has lost hope.

[1] But would not this require אויב (xiii. 24), or צר (xix. 11), or אכזר (xxx. 21)? Bernard's view explains לא זר, but is (I think) not quite satisfactory as a whole. See note 1, p. 144.

[2] In A and C the last clause comes in very abruptly. In B and the Authorized Version the inconsecutiveness is made to disappear, but by expedients of doubtful propriety.

[3] D, not C, is alluded to further on as the *Vindication* theory.

[4] A word here against the misconception that I consider this theory proved. There is much to be said against it—as also against every other which has been proposed. See p. 152.

when the new rendering of the clause is adopted. With this remark I pass on to discuss the passage in detail.

VERSE 25.

ואני ידעתי גאלי חי ואחרון על עפר יקום׃

גאלי] The full phrase גאל הדם occurs in Numb. xxxv. 19 sq. and elsewhere: "The *revenger of blood* himself shall slay the murderer, &c." For גאל alone in the same sense Gesenius quotes[1]: "And they shall be unto you cities of refuge from the *avenger*." It has indeed been denied that the meaning "avenger of blood" is here appropriate; but (1) the balance of testimony seems to be in favour of the view that Job is contemplating a vision of God to be enjoyed after death, and (2) there are reasons for concluding from the context[2] that the hope of an *avenging*, in some sort, is appropriate; for in ver. 22 Job's "friends" are described as his persecutors[3] and as devourers of his flesh, מבשרי לא תשבעו, and in the immediate sequel (ver. 29) he warns them to beware of the punishments of the *sword*.

ואחרון] "Et *postremum* super pulvere staturum." He will "stand at the latter day," or "remain[4] last," upon the earth. The meaning of אחרון is made to vary with that of גאל, whereby some understand God, and others a human avenger[5]. The former view is adopted by Bernard (ed. Chance): "I know Him to be a Being whose existence will have no end or limit. So in Isa. xlviii. 12, God says, אני ראשון ואני אחרון, I am the first, yea, I am the last." But, "Selon plusieurs commentateurs גאלי signifie celui qui dans la postérité me lira, me vengera et me déclarera innocent, et par ואחרון on entend *la génération*, qui, dans un temps éloigné, me rendra la justice que me refusent mes contemporains" (*Cahen*). Elsewhere אחרון is an adjective, but some make it here a noun: "ein *Nachmann* auf dem Staube wird erstehen." It is however too much to say, with Hahn, that if the parallelism be observed, the word "kann *nur* substantivisch genommen werden."

[1] Numb. xxxv. 27.
[2] See also xvi. 13.
[3] Comp. ver. 28.
[4] But can קום, used of persons, have this meaning?
[5] See note 2, p. 144.

עַל עָפָר] This may mean *upon earth*[1], as in Job xli. 23: "*Upon earth* there is not his like, who is made without fear." Compare v. 6; viii. 19. Or it may mean *over my ashes:* "Videtur scopo Jobi melius convenire ut עָפָר intelligamus de pulvere, in quem brevi redacturum se iri Jobus exspectabat;" but the former meaning is perhaps more appropriate and more consonant with the analogy of the book[2].

VERSE 26.

וְאַחַר עוֹרִי נִקְּפוּ זֹאת וּמִבְּשָׂרִי אֶחֱזֶה אֱלוֹהַּ׃

אַחַר] Is this to be taken as a Preposition or as an Adverb?

1. If it be a preposition it may have either the local meaning *behind* or the temporal meaning *after*. Now the obvious meaning of the phrase אַחַר עוֹרִי would, I think, be "*behind* my skin," &c., with reference to the flesh beneath and beyond[3]; and not, "*after* my skin," *i.e.* when it is destroyed and is no more. But since the preceding אַחֲרוֹן and perhaps this verse itself, seem to require a temporal meaning, we are possibly right in rejecting the prepositional rendering altogether.

2. The adverbial rendering, "*postquam destruxerint* hanc cutem meam," is advocated by Gesenius, who quotes אַחַר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה (Job xlii. 7), and אַחַר חִלַּיִן אֶת הָאֲבָנִים (Lev. xiv. 43)—the more complete construction being that of Ezek. xl. 1, אַחַר אֲשֶׁר הֻכְּתָה הָעִיר. The objection of Hirzel, based on the

[1] Others make עָפָר the *arena* or *scene of contention* (like the Latin *pulvis*), comparing the נָאבַק (Gen. xxxii. 25, 26), and παλαίειν (*Umbreit*).

[2] It may be added that the use of עַל עָפָר is opposed to the direct and immediate reference of גֹּאֲלִי to אֱלוֹהַּ. Dillmann writes: "Und war statt יָקוּם eher יָרַד zu sagen da Gott sonst nicht *auf dem Staube sich erhebt* wenn er erscheint; ohnedem erscheint Gott, Cap. 38, gar nicht auf der Erde, sondern spricht aus dem Sturme sein entscheidendes Wort." But cp. xxxi. 14. Dillmann ultimately identifies the Goël with Eloah. See P. S. IV.

[3] Compare Perizol (in Bomberg):—יֹאמַר כִּי תַּחַת עוֹרִי תִּתְכּוּ סַנְטֵר. The meaning of the preposition אַחַר varies with that of its noun. Contrast אַחַר כִּתְלֵנוּ (Cant. ii. 9) with אַחַר הַמַּבּוּל (Gen. ix. 28). If זֹאת be referred proleptically to בְּשָׂר, we may render:—"And beneath my skin they have stricken IT, yet from MY FLESH" &c. i. e. "though a deadly blow, a wound more than skin-deep (Levit. xiii. 3), has been dealt me," &c. Perhaps we should compare ii. 4, 5, noticing that Job says in xix. 21: "the hand of God hath touched me." He *seemed* smitten beyond recovery (ii. 9).

fact that נקפו does not follow immediately upon אחר, is unimportant: suffice it to remark that we are dealing with a poetical passage, and that a changed order of words is sometimes required by the law of emphasis.

נקפו] The word is generally allowed to mean, *pierce, smite, destroy*, and Is. x. 34 is referred to—ונקף סבכי היער בברזל. But what is the construction? On this too there is something like a general agreement, but it may be doubted whether the commonly received opinion, *viz.* that the word is to be taken impersonally[1], is quite satisfactory. If Job is represented as expecting a גאל to arise, whose function it would be to take vengeance on his "friends," why should not THEY be the subject of נקפו? In ver. 22 they are described as devourers of his flesh; why not therefore keep up the figure and render:

And after that, as to my skin, THEY have destroyed this, &c. *i.e.* when they have quite made an end of me, my avenger will yet arise? The clause quoted from Is. x. 34 favours the view that נקפו may imply destruction by external violence at least as naturally as the wasting of disease, for the action is there performed with an iron instrument, נקף בברזל. The language of Job is figurative throughout the passage, which follows (be it observed) immediately upon the words ומבשרי לא תשבעו "and are not satisfied with my flesh?" For this remarkable figure compare: "When the wicked, even mine enemies and my foes, came upon me *to eat up my flesh*, they stumbled and fell" (Ps. xxvii. 2); "Have all the workers of iniquity no knowledge? who *eat up* my people as they eat bread, and call not upon the LORD" (Ps. xiv. 4); "Therefore all they that *devour*[2] thee shall be *devoured*" (Jer. xxx. 16); "who pluck off their skin from off them, and their flesh from off their bones: who also *eat the flesh* of my people, &c." (Mic. iii. 2, 3). We see then

[1] We may notice in passing that the expression "impersonal" is sometimes used inaccurately. In such a phrase, *e. g.* as "*man sagt*," there is an *indefinite* but not an *impersonal* usage, for personal speakers are referred to, although it is left undetermined who they are. Le Clerc takes an indefinite "*homines*, nempe *mali*" for the nominative to נקפו. For the "impersonal" use Job vi. 2; xv. 28; xvi. 10; xxiv. 2—4, &c., are referred to.

[2] Compare Gal. v. 15.

that Job might, according to usage, have described his enemies as the destroyers of his flesh, even if there had been nothing in his own person to suggest the figure; but regard being had to his actual condition, the figure becomes specially appropriate. They say that he is a sinner because a sufferer: he disputes the inference: he looks to his wasted frame: its utter destruction would be to them a proof that they were in the right: it would be their triumph: and from this point of view Job describes them as his actual destroyers.

זאת]. It is not clear to what זאת refers: if to the skin, we might for distinctness read: "after that, as to my skin, they have destroyed THAT." It is indeed objected that זאת, being feminine, cannot refer to עור, which is masculine; but to those who regard the construction as one of apposition—"this" *viz.* "my skin"—rather than of direct concord—"this skin of mine," the objection does not seem insuperable. If [1]זאת refers to the "body," the construction of Gen. iii. 15: "he shall bruise thee [as regards] head," may be compared. In this case too we may avoid contrasting "skin" and "flesh" after the manner of the rendering A, by referring זאת to both hemistichs, as the parallelism—next to be considered—suggests.

On the parallelism of עורי *and* מבשרי.

In support of the view that the עור mentioned in the first hemistich of ver. 26 and the בשר of the second ought, from *a priori* considerations, to be taken as parts of one and the same body, I shall first refer to Biblical usage, and next to the testimony of various translators, who agree in this particular, although holding diverse and contradictory opinions on the general meaning of the passage.

1. To begin with THE IMMEDIATE CONTEXT; we have *skin* and *flesh* mentioned together as parts of one and the same body in ver. 20: "My bone cleaveth to my *skin* and to my *flesh*, and I am escaped with the skin of my teeth." Compare: "My

[1] "*Hoc*, i. e. hæc ossium meorum compages, corpus meum, quod non nominat, quia corporis nomen præ deformatione non merebatur; hoc quod illis commonstrabat" (*Rosenmüller*). See also note 3, p. 135.

flesh is clothed with worms and clods of dust; my *skin* is broken, and become loathsome".....“Thou hast clothed me with *skin* and *flesh*" (Job vii. 5; x. 11); “My *flesh* and my *skin* hath he made old" (Lam. iii. 4). See Lev. viii. 17; Numb. xix. 5. The expression “skin of flesh" occurs several times in Lev. xiii. See too Ezek. xxxvii. 6, 8, 10[1]; Mic. iii. 1—4[2], &c.

2. The authority of versions and commentaries likewise favours the view that עור and בשר are not to be contrasted, but to be taken as parts of one and the same body.

In the obscure LXX. rendering the contrast is avoided:

25. *οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ἀένναός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων ἐπὶ γῆς* 26. *ἀναστῆσαι τὸ δέρμα* (al. *σῶμά*) *μου τὸ ἀναντλοῦν ταῦτα· παρὰ γὰρ κυρίου ταῦτά μοι συνετελέσθη,* 27. *ἃ ἐγὼ ἐμαυτῷ συνεπίσταμαι, ἃ ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου ἑώρακε καὶ οὐκ ἄλλος, πάντα δέ μοι συντετέλεσται ἐν κόλπῳ.*

In the Syriac there is a direct parallelism between *skin* and *flesh:*

ܘܒܣܪܝ ܐܚܪܝ ܕܢܚܙܐ ܠܗ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܒܦܓܪܝ ܕܐܦ ܒܣܡܪ ܕܐܦ ܒܥܘܪܝ

and so too in the Arabic:

وعلى جلدى ضاقت هذه وعلى بشرى

The Vulgate does violence to the first hemistich in order to preserve the parallelism, assuming that the second points to a resurrection:

Et rursum circumdabor pelle mea, et in carne mea videbo Deum meum.

With this compare Schlottmann's argument for the negative rendering[3] of the preposition in מבשרי:

“Nun bemerkten wir aber bereits ver. 26 dass die negative Auffassung des מן in מבשרי für den Zusammenhang natürlichere ist. Anders wär' es freilich, wenn man mit Hieronymus in dem ersten Gliede das עורי נקפו זאת von dem Umgeben mit einer neuen Haut verstehen könnte, was aber jetzt noch schwerlich irgend jemand als sprachlich möglich vertheidigen wird."

Aben Ezra takes בשר as well as עור to be included in the

[1] Quoted on p. 140. [2] Quoted on p. 149. [3] See p. 141.

זאת, briefly remarking,

וענין זאת עצמי ועורי ובסרי׃

For another attempt to preserve the parallelism, see Mendelssohn's Bible, wherein the אחר is made to apply to both clauses alike, thus:

Wann lange schon diese Haut zernagt, lange schon Gott in meinem Leibe nimmer sichtbar ist.

Vatablus writes:

"Locus obscurus in quo multa subaudienda, ut intelligatur. *Ac post pellem meam* perforatam,.....ac dolores meos qui *contriverunt istud* os [sing. pro plur. *i.e.* hæc ossa mea] *et a carne mea* [*i.e.* post carnem meam attritam, h. e. post afflictionem perpessam in carne mea] *videbo Deum.*"

Thus we see that the testimony in favour of the parallelism of עור and בשר is very varied, whether we argue from Biblical usage or from the opinions of commentators on the passage in question. Those who see therein the doctrine of an incorporeal future life, hold that a joint or successive destruction of *skin* and *flesh* is spoken of: those who maintain the theory C either agree grammatically with these last, or conceive of the בשר as a something which remains when the עור of the same body has been destroyed: while even of those who argue for a *Resurrection*, some, as Jerome, are found who sacrifice the first hemistich in order to preserve the parallelism.

ומבשרי]. I propose to render the מן as in A and C, but to understand בשר of *dead*-flesh, in accordance with the following analogies.

The word is used (writes Gesenius), "de carne pecudum quæ comeditur, Exod. xvi. 12; Lev. vii. 19; Numb. xi. 4, 13...; Job xxxi. 31, in laude hospitalitatis מי יתן מבשרו לא נשבע׃ —*ubi est qui carne ejus* (*i.e.* dapibus ejus) *satiatus non sit?*" It is also used of inanimate human flesh, as in 2 Kings iv. 32, 34: "And when Elisha was come into the house, behold, the child was dead...and he stretched himself upon the child; and the *flesh* of the child waxed warm." Compare: "In the portion of Jezreel shall dogs eat the *flesh* of Jezebel" (2 Kings ix. 36); "And I will cause them to eat the *flesh* of their sons and the

flesh of their daughters, and they shall eat every one the *flesh* of his friend in the siege and straitness, wherewith their enemies, and they that seek their lives shall straiten them" (Jer. xix. 9); "The dead bodies of thy servants have they given to be meat unto the fowls of heaven, the *flesh* of thy saints unto the beasts of the earth" (Ps. lxxix. 2). We may add that בשר is opposed to נפש—"And shall consume the glory of his forest, and of his fruitful field, both *soul* and *body* מנפש ועד בשר" (Is. x. 18); and to רוח; "Now the Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses *flesh*, and not *spirit*" (Is. xxxi. 3).

A very striking illustration still remains to be quoted[1].

"And I will lay sinews upon you, and will bring up *flesh* upon you, and cover you with *skin*, and put *breath* in you, and *ye shall* live... And when I beheld, lo, the sinews and the *flesh* came up upon them, and the *skin* covered them above: but *there was no breath* in them...So I prophesied as he commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood up upon their feet, an exceeding great army" (Ezek. xxxvii. 6, 8, 10).

Here we have first the "flesh," &c. making up the *mass* of the body: next the "skin" giving completeness to its *form:* but as yet *no breath nor life.* In Job xix. 26 we may suppose this sequence reversed: the עור being destroyed, a dead shapeless mass of בשר remains:

And after that, as to my skin, they have destroyed this,
Even from my flesh
And from my dead-flesh } I shall see God.

Thus Job is made to express the assurance that when his "skin" had been destroyed, and when he should have been reduced to a shapeless mass of "flesh," still from that flesh[2] he

[1] See also Numb. xii. 12: "as one dead, of whom the flesh is half-consumed."

[2] If "to see God" (=*to see His day* xxiv. 1) means to see traces of divine retribution in the world [p. 144], the proposed rendering would amount to the following: "I shall see that day when I am in my grave;" or, "I shall have the satisfaction of being vindicated when I am dead." Compare the "*audacissima prosopopœia*" of Is. xiv. 4 sq. In Ezek. xxxii. 31 we have a very striking parallel:—"*Pharaoh shall see them, and shall be comforted over all his multitude, even Pharaoh and all his army slain by the sword.*" Here emotions are poetically ascribed to the

should see God: his innocence would be asserted though the worst came to the worst: an avenger would arise over his mangled corpse. In the verse thus rendered there is a vigour and fierceness of assertion, well suited to the character of Job and to his desperate condition. Though reduced to the last extremity he was sure that he should still be vindicated: "till I die I will not remove my integrity from me" (xxvii. 5): "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him[1]" (xiii. 15).

Although the above rendering of the preposition in מבשרי (which is common to A, C and D) is grammatically simple, it may be well to notice and propose for consideration certain others[2].

Negative renderings of מבשרי.

(i) Vatablus, as we have seen, makes אחר עורי and מבשרי parallel, rendering the one "post pellem meam" and the other "a carne mea," in the sense, *post*[3] *carnem meam attritam*. In support of this rendering the מרחם of Job iii. 11 is sometimes quoted:—"Why did I not die *from the womb?*" Compare פשע מבטן, "a transgressor *from the belly*." But רחם and בטן naturally associate themselves with a particular epoch, *viz.* the time of birth: they carry with them a temporal meaning: and hence also מרחם and מבטן may have a temporal meaning. We could not however argue from this to a temporal meaning of מבשרי unless it were first shewn that בשר alone might be used as marking an epoch; and although a suitable usage occurs in Heb. v. 7—"Who *in the days of his flesh*, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, &c." it has yet to be shewn that there is in the Old Testament any analogous use of בשר.

(ii) But the negative rendering is more usually presented in the form, "*out of* my flesh," in the sense, "frei vom Leibe."

dead Pharaoh, very similar in kind to those which the proposed rendering of xix. 26 would make Job ascribe to himself after death. Job will rejoice to be vindicated: Pharaoh "consolabitur se tot tantosque pœnarum habere socios." Cp. Job iii. 18; xxi. 33.

[1] The true rendering of this verse is doubtful. [2] See also P. S.

[3] I call this rendering "negative" because when posteriority is predicated of one thing with respect to another, the presence of that other is thereby negatived.

On this Dr Pusey remarks[1] that, "The rendering of מבשרי, *without my flesh*, adopted by Davidson, ii. 227, from Ewald, &c. is unidiomatic and unnatural. מן can no more, of itself, mean without, than our *from*. Where we might render *without*, the meaning is gained from the context."

Various passages, which are quite inappropriate, have been loosely quoted in support of the simply *negative* rendering "without," which we must be careful to distinguish from the common *privative* rendering of the מן. An example of the latter occurs in Ps. lxxxiii. 5: "Come and let us cut them off from [being] a nation;" where the ceasing to be a nation is to *result from* the cutting off—a construction clearly unsuited to Job xix. 26, where the being without flesh does not *result from* seeing God. In Mic. iii. 6, (wrongly quoted for the negative rendering) we have another good example of this *privative* sense: "There shall be a night to מחזון, from vision *i.e. hiding all vision from you*," as Dr Pusey rightly remarks. This appears plainly enough from the parallelism, as shewn by the English version: "Therefore night shall be unto you, *that ye shall not have a vision;* and it shall be dark unto you, מקסם, that ye shall not divine; and the sun shall go down over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them. Then shall the seers be ashamed, and the diviners confounded: yea, they shall all cover their lips; for there is no answer of God" (Mic. iii. 6, 7). Here the lack of vision *results from* the "night" which falls upon the prophets, and there is a necessary connexion between the two.

But the passages most frequently quoted in support of the negative rendering are:

Job xi. 15 אז תשא פניך ממום

Job xxi. 9 בתיהם שלום מפחד

The former of these seems at first sight to the point, but perhaps the מן here should rather be taken in connexion with the verb נשא, in the sense of *taking away from*:—"Then shalt thou lift thy face aloof (or away) from blemish." In Job xxi. 9 we find a still more precarious illustration of the required

[1] In his *Daniel the Prophet*, ed. 2, p. 509.

negative rendering, for there is a natural contrast between *peace* and *fear*, the former producing an absence of the latter. "Their houses are peace, without fear"—or as we might say, "at peace from fear," *i. e.* without fear by reason of their being at peace.

Others have quoted Is. xxix. 18,

מאפל ומחשך עיני עורים תראינה׃

"*A caligine et tenebris, i. e.* remotis tenebris, *oculi cæcorum videbunt.*"

But it may be doubted whether the foregoing explanation (Rosenmüller's) of the verse is the true one. There is indeed an obvious contrast here described between the former gloom and the succeeding light, but is not this expressed solely by the natural antagonism between the ideas of *seeing* (ראה) and *darkness* (אפל), without the help of the supposed negative use of מן? In Is. ix. 2, such a way of expressing the same contrast is chosen: "the walkers (הלכים) in darkness have seen a great light,"—not, the people *that walked &c.* So in Is. xxix. 18, we may take the rendering of the Authorized Version: "And in that day shall the deaf hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind shall see out of obscurity, and out of darkness"—where it is predicted that persons described as "deaf" shall hear, and persons described as "blind" and in darkness, looking out of that darkness shall see: "the blind shall see FROM AMID their darkness," not, "*remotis tenebris.*" The removal of the darkness is implied by תראינה, just as in the first hemistich the removal of deafness is implied by ושמעו, whereas explicitly the persons there in question are described as "deaf." Neither this, then, nor any one of the foregoing illustrations can be said certainly to favour the required negative use of מן.

Partitive renderings of ומבשרי.

(i) Taking the מן partitively we may read: "After they have destroyed my skin and my flesh (*lit.* of-my-flesh);" the partitive accusative being used because the flesh is not so completely destroyed but that something of it—a mangled

corpse—remains. For partitive uses of מן see Gesen. *Thesaur.* 800. b.

(ii) Or we may suppose a zeugma and aposiopesis. The same word ומבשרי occurs in ver. 22, followed by לא תשבעו. Would not ver. 26 have seemed to end very naturally: "when they have penetrated my skin, and of my flesh HAVE HAD THEIR FILL, ומבשרי שבעו"? Perhaps then we may suppose נקפו to carry with it another verb, which the recurring ומבשרי marks out as the שבע of ver. 22, from which same verse this whole passage springs. Thus the construction would be explicitly incomplete :—

After that, as to my skin, they have destroyed that,
And of my flesh **** I shall see God.

אחזה אלוה] It seems best to understand this of the traces of Divine retribution, as shewn in Job's vindication; although Rabbinic commentators and others have referred it to afflictions[1]: "the hand of God hath touched me" (ver. 21). In chap. xxiii. 9, the same verb is used: "On the left hand, where he doth work, ולא אחז, but I cannot behold him;" and there Job's anxiety is that his innocence might be established. It recurs in xxiv. 1: "Why...do they that know Him not see His days (לא חזו ימיו)?" *i.e.* His days of vengeance on their oppressors. Notice especially ver. 12, cp. xxxv. 14. I shall assume then that in chap. xix. 26, Job looks to have his innocence asserted: a גאל would arise after his death to vindicate him, and *in the fact of that vindication*[2] he would "see God."

VERSE V.

אשר אני אחזה לי ועיני ראו ולא זר
כלו כליתי בחקי:

כלו וג׳]. *Consumuntur renes mei in sinu meo.*

This clause is probably indicative of strong desire, sc. for the realization of what had been before described. The word

[1] Rendering אחזה as a present. So Rashi, ומנסרי לחני רוחה מספטיס. But xlii. 5 shews that Job had *not* seen God before. Hence אחזה must be predictive or optative. But see P. S. v.

[2] God would be seen indirectly, through the action of the Goël. Compare ii. 5—7 with xix. 21.

כלה is used elsewhere of ardent longing: "My soul longeth, yea, even *fainteth* for the courts of the LORD" (Ps. lxxxiv. 2); "My soul *fainteth* for thy salvation: [*but*][1] I hope in thy word. Mine eyes *fail* for thy word, saying, When wilt thou comfort me?" (Ps. cxix. 81, 82). Cp. Ps. cxliii. 7. "Bene igitur Hieronymus verba nostra vertit: *reposita est hæc spes mea in sinu meo*" (Rosenmüller). Compare further, יסרוני כליותי, Ps. xvi. 7.

אשר אני אחזה וג׳]. This clause, as commonly rendered, seems fatal to the view that Job simply looks for vindication after death; but another rendering may be proposed, which is consistent with that view, and which has the advantage of joining the two clauses of the verse harmoniously together. Instead of reading them disjointedly,

Whom[2] I shall see for myself...
My reins are consumed—

we may thus connect them:—

Whom that I {might / may} see...
My reins {have been / are} consumed.

i. e. whom to see has been, or is, my consuming desire.

There are two slightly different ways of arriving at this rendering.

1. It is remarked in the grammars that the infinitive may stand for the future &c., and *vice versa*. Subjoined are some examples[3].

In Prov. i. 2—6 ישמע breaks in upon a series of infinitives, and is perhaps best rendered as below; "To know wisdom and instruction; To perceive the words of understanding; To receive the instructions of wisdom, justice, and judgment, and equity; To give subtilty to the simple, to the young man knowledge and discretion. THAT the wise MAY HEAR and increase learning, and the man of understanding attain unto wise counsels.

[1] There is no contrast in the original. The parallelism shews that כלתה expresses *desire*.

[2] If this verse is a mere reiteration the relative seems otiose. Why not "I shall see *Him*..."?

[3] The small capitals will shew where I have given the quasi-infinitival rendering by way of suggestion and without authority.

To understand a proverb, and the interpretation; the words of the wise, and their dark sayings." Similar parallelisms occur in Prov. ii. 8, and v. 2: "That thou mayest regard (לשמר) discretion, and that thy lips may keep (ינצרו) knowledge." Compare Prov. xx. 25: "It is a snare to a man that he should devour (ילע) that which is holy, and after vows to make enquiry" (לבקר). Prov. xxviii. 21: "To have respect of persons (הכר פנים) is not good: and THAT for a piece of bread a man SHOULD TRANSGRESS" (יפשע). Is. lviii. 5, 7: "Is it to bow down (הלכף) his head like a bulrush, and to spread (יציע) sackcloth and ashes under him?...Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose (פתח) the bands of wickedness, to undo (התר) the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go (שלח) free, and that ye break (תנתקו) every yoke? Is it not to deal (פרס) thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring (תביא) the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him (וכסיתו), and that thou hide not thyself (תתעלם) from thine own flesh?" Compare 1 Sam. ii. 3; Prov. xxiii. 35; Hos. i. 6; Ezek. viii. 6; Esth. viii. 6; Lam. iv. 4; Job xxxii. 22; and conversely Ezek. xxi. 20. In Lev. ix. 6 we read: "This is the thing which the LORD commanded that ye should do, צוה יהוה תעשו," and in Deut. xxxiii. 11: Smite through the loins of them that rise against him, and of them that hate him, that they rise not again" (*lit.* from that-they-rise, מן־יקומון). Let one more example (from Ps. xvi. 7) suffice: "THAT I SHOULD BLESS [= to bless] the LORD who hath given me counsel, even in the night-seasons have my reins admonished me."

2. The construction above illustrated may be regarded from a slightly different point of view. Of אשר אחזה, if isolated from the context, a not unnatural rendering would be, "that I may, or might, see." Compare Gen. xi. 7; Deut. iv. 40; Dan. i. 8. Lee indeed asserts boldly that the relative ren-

[1] For the full form of this construction compare במקום אשר־יאמר להם. "Instead of their being [*lit.* that they should be] called" (Hos. ii. 1); and see the next paragraph.

dering of the words as they occur in Job xix. 27 is ungrammatical, and adopts the construction ידעתי...אשר אחזה (ver. 25, 27), which is simple enough, only that two verses intervene. But to return, אשר אחזה *may* certainly be rendered conjunctively, "that I might see." Now let it be required to express, "whom that I might see." To do this we should prefix another אשר taken relatively; but the cumbrous phrase אשר אשר אחזה would at once reduce itself by ellipsis to אשר אחזה, the אשר serving at once for *relative* and *conjunction.*

ולא זר] LXX. *καὶ οὐκ ἄλλος.* Compare: "Let another man (זר) praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips" (Prov. xxvii. 2). Job trusts even after death to be vindicated, and thus *ipso facto* to see God. But this is only a partial satisfaction, for to see God[1] with the eyes of his own living self had been his consuming desire:

Whom that I might see[2] for myself,
And mine own eyes had beheld,
And not another's,
My reins have consumed within me.

This gives the full force of ולא זר "*et non pas un étranger,* tandis que s'il arrive un vengeur après sa mort, ce n'est pas lui qui le voit" (*Cahen*); and we may account perhaps slightly better than on any other theory for the use of the past tense ראו, if we suppose him to be expressing the disappointed hope that by that time he might *already have seen.*

Recapitulation.

The *vindication* theory which has been advocated must of course be rejected if the usual rendering of the clause אשר אני

[1] Thus I take the expression in two senses—a higher and a lower. Hufnagel, not dissimilarly: "Die Redensart *Gott sehen* ist einer doppelten Erklärung fähig. Nach diesem Leben zu Gott kommen, oder, einen gnädigen Gott haben." In connexion with the latter he refers to Job xiii. 25; Ps. xxxi. 17; lxix. 18; civ. 29.

[2] Compare further for this construction Bernard's rendering of Job xiv. 14, 15: "...can I hope...[that] *Thou mayest* [still] *call,...*" (איחל...תקרא). This is specially to the point because an expression of "hope" precedes. So in xxxiv. 36: "My desire (is that) Job may be tried". Cp. moreover Ps. cxix. 17, גמל על עבדך אחיה. In xvi. 21, ויוכח, *that one might plead,* follows an expression of longing.

אחזה וגו׳ be correct; but (this objection to it being supposed surmounted) it agrees well with the general tenour of the context, and may be said to account more naturally than any other theory for some of the more remarkable expressions employed in the passage.

1. "Oh that my words were now written, &c." (ver. 23, 24). "Désespérant de se faire écouter par ses adversaires, il émet le vœu qu'au moins la postérité lui rende justice" (*Cahen*). He is confident of ultimate vindication, and is anxious to have it known that he all along expected it. When it comes he will not be alive to speak for himself, and for this cause he is anxious that his confidence might be placed imperishably on record.

2. His adversaries are devourers of his flesh (ver. 22), and he threatens them with "punishments of the sword' (ver. 29). It is then natural to understand by Goël (ver. 25), an *avenger of blood*[1], who should maintain his cause against those adversaries after his death.

3. THEY are the destroyers[2] of his "skin," &c. (ver. 26). This is more forcible than to take נקפו "impersonally." The verb is used of external violence in Is. x. 34: "And he shall *cut down* the thickets of the forest WITH IRON."

4. *Skin* and *flesh* are to be taken as parts of the same body, whatever be the precise significance of the זאת.

5. בשר, *dead-flesh*, that which remains when the עור, which completes the form of the body, is subtracted. Conversely in Ezek. xxxvii. 6—10, first *flesh* is added to the dry bones, then *skin* covers it, and lastly *life* is breathed into the bodies thus completed.

6. "Even[3] from my flesh," though only a mangled corpse, I shall see God, *sc.* in my vindication. This expresses a hope against hope suited to Job's tone and condition.

7. Thus to see God, *viz.* by being vindicated after death, is a partial satisfaction: "It has been my earnest desire to be vindicated while yet alive, and thus to see God with my own

[1] "O earth, cover not thou my blood" (xvi. 18).

[2] So Rashi. Compare xvi. 11.

[3] This does not necessarily exclude a lingering hope that it may yet be well with him in life.

bodily eyes: others will be the actual witnesses of that justification, which I have longed to see for myself."

8. The conjunctive quasi-infinitive rendering: "whom to see (*lit.* that I may or might see)," may indeed be adapted to the theories A, B, C, but the *vindication* theory has the advantage of giving a very pointed contrast, and enables us to render the past tense ראו literally: "I shall see God (in my vindication); Him whom I had hoped, alas, to see *for myself*—yea, that mine own eyes might ere this have gazed upon."

9. The conjunctive rendering in ver. 27[1] joins the classes harmoniously together.

I subjoin a translation of the whole passage, which is intended to bring out the vindication theory.

I know that my avenger liveth,
And hereafter shall arise on earth,
And after that, as to my skin, they have destroyed that,
And from my dead-flesh—I shall see Eloah,
Whom that I might see for myself
(Yea, that mine eyes had beheld),
And not another,
My reins have failed within my frame.

P.S. (i) Allusion has already been made to the following passage:—

"And I said, Hear, I pray you, O heads of Jacob, and ye princes of the house of Israel; Is it not for you to know judgement? Who hate the good, and love the evil; who pluck off their skin (עורם) from off them, and their flesh (ושארם) from off their bones; who also eat the flesh of my people, and flay their skin from off them; and they break their bones, and chop them in pieces, as for the pot, and as flesh within the caldron. Then shall they cry unto the LORD, but he will not hear them:

[1] Cahen in some sort anticipates the above treatment of the *second* אחזה, when he writes on the *first:* "Selon quelques commentateurs c'est un vœu: Pourquoi ne verrais-je Dieu qu'après ma mort? Je voudrais avoir cette joie pendant ma vie." I have not traced this further, nor had I consulted Cahen when I formed the theory advocated in the text. In x. 18 אגוע stands for: "O that I had [or, I ought to have] given up the ghost." So in xix. 27 we might render: "Whom I would fain have seen, &c."

he will even *hide his face* from them at that time, as they have behaved themselves ill in their doings." (Mic. iii. 1—4).

This illustrates both the parallelism of *skin* and *flesh*, and the destruction of Job's flesh conceived of figuratively as the act of his adversaries: in one respect it illustrates more especially the partitive renderings (p. 143) which describe the successive destruction of skin and flesh. Contrast moreover the expression *hide His face* (ver. 4), with Job's אחזה אלוה, *I shall see God.*

(ii) Those who think Job xix. 25—27 hopelessly obscure would perhaps prefer a rendering which reproduces the ambiguities of the Hebrew. The views A, C, D may be extracted from the following version:

I know that my avenger liveth,
And in aftertime shall stand upon [this] dust,
And after that, as to my skin, they have destroyed this,
And from my flesh, I shall see Eloah,
Whom that I might see for myself, and mine eyes might behold, and not another,
My reins have consumed within me.

The view B (now a favourite) may also be included, if instead of, "from my flesh," we read ambiguously, "out of my flesh."

(iii) The negative rendering of מבשרי has many advocates but not many grammatical parallels. Philippson has in the two hemistichs of v. 27; *Leib* and *ohne Körper*. Delitzsch (so Gesenius *q.v.*) refers to Numb. xv. 24: "If ought be committed by ignorance, מעיני העדה, *without the knowledge* of the congregation, &c." This illustration is perhaps in a manner appropriate, but less so some others which are adduced, with the remark that the required negative rendering is, "eine ziemlich häufige Gebrauchsweise dieser Präposition." So far as the usage of מן is concerned, the rendering: "from my flesh," has certainly the advantage; but it must be granted that the argument from the parallelism favours those renderings which introduce a joint or successive destruction of "skin" and "flesh." This argument does not however oppose itself to the rendering "from my flesh," where "flesh" is complementary to "skin;" for as in

the first hemistich of ver. 20 a process of destruction is described, while the part which escapes destruction is mentioned by way of contrast in the second: "My bone cleaveth to my skin and to my flesh, and I am escaped with the skin of my teeth;" so in ver. 26 we may contrast the remaining בשר with the עור already destroyed. But lastly, it may be urged (as above on אחר) that the use of a preposition is subject to some modification from its noun; granted then that a certain meaning of מן is in the abstract admissible, we should have still to ask whether that meaning is admissible in connexion with a particular noun[1]. And would not the rendering, "without[2] *my flesh*," sound strange to the Hebraist, even if there were one or two different connexions in which מן might mean "without"?

(iv) The rendering, "from (= in) my flesh," is psychologically not without harshness. Simpler in itself, if hard to accommodate to the context, is the meaning: "of my flesh, or *kindred*," which would naturally describe the Goël. See Gen. ii. 23; xxxvii. 27; xxix. 14; Jud. ix. 2; 1 Chron. xi. 1; Neh. v. 5. Omitting Eloah, we may read: "And hereafter he shall stand upon this dust (yea, after my skin, &c.), and of, or from, my flesh[3] I shall see * * *"; sc. the kindred Goël, who would spring from his ashes. As regards Eloah, we may now suppose (1) that Job suddenly rises above his original conception of a human avenger into the unexpected climax: "werd' ich schauen —Gott" (*Ewald.* See *Dillmann*); or (2) that by seeing God he means seeing His just judgement executed by a human instrument[4]; or (3) that Eloah may stand directly for a human arbiter. So Wolfssohn, quoted by Bernard, on xvi. 20. For the non-literal *seeing*, cp. again Ezek. xxxii. 31. If Job's hope is in posterity, xx. 10 is a natural retort. Cp. Ps. cix. 13.

(v) Perhaps greater prominence should have been given to

[1] Could we (as Chance puts it) write איש מעינים for "A man *without eyes*"?

[2] Simpler perhaps than this would be the privative rendering, "*So that I no longer have* any flesh," where we detach the affix (Ps. cxv. 17), and carry on the idea of destruction from the preceding clause. Compare Job xxxiii. 21: "His flesh is consumed away, *that it cannot be seen.*"

[3] Elsewhere, I think, מן follows חזה in Ex. xviii. 21 only.

[4] "Thou shalt be to him instead of God" (Ex. iv. 16).

the rendering: "From [the state of] my flesh I can see God." It is grammatically simple and has been adopted by many. Against it compare xxiii. 9, quoted on p. 144. But in Numb. xxiv. 7, according to a common rendering, "I can see," means "I can see in prospect, or foresee:" "I can see him (or it), but not now; I can behold him (or it), but *not nigh*," i.e. I can see *in the distance*. So Job might say: "I can see (in prospect) a manifestation of God from or with respect to, my flesh = I can foresee my vindication after death."

(vi) Some details in Job xix. 25—27 being exceedingly obscure, I have thought it well to propose for consideration various expedients which have suggested themselves, although in some cases I do not myself think them very plausible. Details apart, the theory D has the twofold advantage of being suggested by the context and not contradicting anything which occurs elsewhere in the book[1]. Against A is the fact that the argument proceeds precisely as if Job had no idea of a resurrection: also A contains a solution of Job's difficulties, and thus makes the actual ending of the book, with its appeal to his ignorance, an anticlimax. The argument against B is similar, unless "Future Life" means an imperfect and shadowy existence, in which case B would approximate to D. Against C, unless limited to mere Vindication, is the absence of any subsequent trace of the hope involved: moreover it is not required by (if consistent with) the plan of the book that Job in the midst of his perplexities should know what was to be their end: while there are independent arguments for the view that the Goël is conceived of as one who should appear after Job's death. Thus much as regards the *form* of Job's utterance; but what allowance is to be made for the poetical nature of its expression, and for the style and purport of the book as a whole, and whether the theory A, if wrong as an interpretation, be not a right (or the only possible) application for a believer in the resurrection, are questions of importance which still remain to be discussed—questions however which are more or less unsuited for discussion in the *Journal of Philology*.

C. TAYLOR.

[1] "Mais ces éclairs sont toujours suivis de plus profondes ténèbres."

THE HISTORY OF THE RAVENNA MANUSCRIPT OF ARISTOPHANES.

The now celebrated Ravenna MS., the only one which contains all the extant plays, was first made known to modern scholars by Invernizi, who professed to have collated it for his edition of Aristophanes, published in 1794. Of his collation Bekker speaks in the following terms: 'Ravennatem qui ante me versavit incredibili socordia cum pari inscitia conjuncta &c.' The collation which Bekker himself made in 1818, with all his diligence and knowledge, is far from accurate, probably because the time at his disposal was too short for the due performance of his task. His collation of the Venetian MS., which is second only in antiquity and importance to the Ravenna, is even more imperfect, though, as he tells us, he examined it twice, at Paris in 1812 and at Venice in 1819. Dindorf relied entirely upon Bekker; and no subsequent edition of the whole of Aristophanes' plays has been based upon a new collation of these MSS. In 1852 I spent three weeks at Ravenna, noting all that seemed to me important, and in 1867 I again made a minute collation of the MS. in the *Acharnenses, Equites,* and detached passages of other plays. In 1866-1867 my friend Dr Adolf von Velsen, of Saarbrück, made a thorough and complete collation of both the Ravenna and Venice MSS., with a view to an edition of the Poet. The *Equites,* which we noticed in the last number of the Journal, is the only play he has yet published. The scholia of the Ravenna MS. were transcribed in 1837 for Dindorf's edition by M. Miller[1]. So far as I know no serious

[1] Now librarian to the Corps Législatif at Paris, a gentleman as distinguished for his courtesy as his learning. His *Mélanges de Littérature Grecque* is the product of long and diligent research.

attempt has been made to trace the history of the MS. I have endeavoured to do this, and propose here to give briefly an account of my researches, which have perhaps been more interesting to myself than I can make them to my readers, especially as they have led to so little in the way of definite result.

The MS. is a large folio of parchment consisting of 191 leaves, excluding the fly-leaves at either end. It contains the eleven plays in the following order: 1. *Plutus*, 2. *Clouds*, 3. *Frogs*, 4. *Birds*, 5. *Knights*, 6. *Peace*, 7. *Lysistrate*, 8. *Acharnians*, 9. *Wasps*, 10. *Thesmophoriazusæ*, and 11. *Ecclesiazusæ*.

The text is in a cursive hand, the scholia in the margin for the most part in small uncial characters, which were probably adopted in order to discriminate the commentary from the text. The scholia were not written at the same time as the text, because generally the ink is of a different colour, but they were probably added by the same hand, because we frequently find lines of the text, which had been accidentally omitted, given in the margin in the same ink as the scholia and the same cursive writing as the original text.

The MS. has been corrected in parts by at least three different hands, one a tremulous hand of nearly the same date as the MS. itself, another in blacker ink of the 14th or early in the 15th century, whose alterations are particularly frequent in the *Clouds*, and one if not two still later in the *Lysistrate* and *Thesmophoriazusæ*, of which I shall have to speak more particularly by and by.

On the fly-leaf at the beginning we read: 'Aristophanis Codex Optimus cum argumentis et scholiis anonymi. Scriptus sæculo x. Ita censebat Cyrillus Martinius Florentinus[1].' By the kindness of my learned friend Signor Francesco Palermo, late librarian to the Grand Duke, I am informed that this Cyrillo Martini was a Priest, coadjutor of Biscioni who was made librarian of the Laurentian in 1741. He was intrusted

[1] This has given rise to a curious error in Murray's *Hand-Book*, where *àpropos* of the Ravenna Library we read: 'Among its MS. collections the most precious is the celebrated *Aristophanes, copied in the 10th century by Cyrillus Machirius, a Florentine.*'

by Biscioni with the task of describing and cataloguing the Greek MSS. in the Library, and was doubtless a competent judge.

Bekker indeed says that he does not see why the Ravenna MS. and those of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Demosthenes in the Laurentian, which have a strong resemblance to it, should be thought older than the 11th century. But Herr Müller, of Florence, who has spent his life in the thankless labour of copying and collating MSS. for other editors, and Dr von Velsen both assign them to the 10th century. We shall probably be right if we suppose that it was written some time during the last century of the Basilian dynasty, which came to an end in 1057, and in one of the monasteries, so richly dotated by the later princes of that family, 'in which' (to use Mr Finlay's words) 'the monks were living together rather like clubs of wealthy bachelors than as holy societies of virtuous cenobites.' (*History of the Byzantine Empire,* B. III. c. 1.) Such persons were more likely to select the works of Aristophanes for their library and to pay for the production of a costly and sumptuous book, for such it must have been, than their successors, when Isaac Comnenus had confiscated the endowments of the monasteries and when consequently they were tenanted no longer by the younger sons of noble houses, but by the sons of peasants completely ignorant of pagan literature and fanatically prejudiced against it.

Now for the history of the MS. It is at present in the Biblioteca Communale of Ravenna, also called Biblioteca Classense, because it belonged to the monks of Classe of the Camaldolite order. At the dissolution of the monasteries under the French both convent and library were made over to the town, and thus the books were saved from dispersion.

The convent, which owes its foundation to S. Romualdo, was originally adjacent to the church of S. Apollinare in Classe, two miles outside the walls of Ravenna. In 1512 it was attacked by the French troops, and its Abbot, Andrea Secchini, slain in a vain attempt to defend it. The monks for safety removed to a place within the walls, and built the stately convent which still bears their name. According to the *Annales Camaldolenses* it

was begun in 1512, and over the principal entrance is the date 1523, indicating, I suppose, its completion in that year.

There appears to be no record of the time when, or of the person by whom, the library was founded. Perhaps it was the Cardinal Giulio della Rovere, Archbishop of Ravenna from 1566 to 1578, who is mentioned in the *Annales* as having been 'Insignis Benefactor ordinis Camaldolensis.' He may have inherited something of the bibliomania which distinguished the Dukes of Urbino, to whose principality his family had succeeded by favour of Sixtus IV. In the library itself is a portrait of a former monk, the Padre Canneti, under which is an inscription recording that he enriched the collection 'selectis et copiosissimis codicibus.' His 'floruit,' as I was told, was in the beginning of the last century. There is nothing to shew how or when the Manuscript of Aristophanes was added to the library. The present librarian told me that he had heard from his predecessor a tradition that it had been bought for a very small sum at a book-stall in Rome. Perhaps it was among the acquisitions of the Padre Canneti. But though the clue to its recent history thus fails us, let us see whether we cannot recover it at an earlier period.

The Aldine Edition, the Editio Princeps, of Aristophanes was published at Venice in 1498. It contains nine of the Comedies, *i.e.* all except the *Lysistrate* and *Thesmophoriazusæ*. In the Latin Preface Aldus says 'Decimam Lysistratam ideo prætermisimus quod vix dimidiata a nobis haberi potest.' It does not appear that he or his editor Musurus had even heard of the *Thesmophoriazusæ*. In this edition there was an important omission in the *Pax* (lines 947—1011, ed. Dindorf, from *τὸ καινοῦν*...to *τὸν δ' ὀτοτύζειν*) which was indicated by the word *λείπει*, and instead of the three concluding lines of the same play,

ὦ χαίρετε, χαίρετ' ἄν-
δρες, κἂν ξυνέπησθέ μοι
πλακοῦντας ἔδεσθε,

we read

Λείπει.
πλακοῦντας ἔδεσθε.

These lacunæ were not supplied in the second, or Juntine,

edition, published at Florence in 1515. In the preface Bernard Junta, dedicating the book 'nobili patritio domino Francisco Accolto electo episcopo anconitano,' says: 'Putabam, vir doctissime, duas quoque notioribus his addere posse nondum ab aliis impressas, quæ cito forsan abs te nostra ope his novem comitatæ legi poterunt, in forsan Euphrosyni bonini præceptoris tui et aliorum tuorum pariterque nostrorum amicorum promissa irrita quod credere nequeo in leves abibunt auras.'

The printing of this edition was completed, as the colophon informs us, in the month of September, 1515.

Early in the following year the same printer put forth for the first time the two plays alluded to in his preface to the former volume, the *Thesmophoriazusæ* and *Lysistrate.* 'His summa manus imposita est quinto kl' Februarii M.D.XV. Leonis Papæ nostri anno tertio,' *i.e.* according to our modern reckoning, January 28, 1516. In the preface, also addressed to Francesco Accolti, Bernard Junta says: 'Venit, mi Francisce, expectata dies illa in qua ex urbinate bibliotheca antiquissimum Aristophanis exemplar nacti sumus ibique inter alias Λυσιστράτην καὶ Θεσμοφοριαζούσας id est Lysistratem et Cereri sacrificantes feminas non alias visas comedias invenimus hasque et tuo nomine cudere tibique dicare, amicorum optime, visum est.' He then complains of the corruption of the text, and in a note at the end adds: 'Habes candide lector nusquam hactenus impressas binas Aristophanis comedias...quas ex codice adeo vetusto excerpsimus ut altera interdum dictionis pars ibi desideretur.' This is by no means a correct description of the MS. for it implies that its leaves had been worn or its writing defaced by age, which is not the case. Is this mere carelessness or deliberate mystification? Euphrosyno Bonini, above mentioned, was a native of Florence, and, as Poccianti in his *Catalogo degli autori Fiorentini* tells us, at one time Professor of Greek Literature in the University of Pisa. He also translated Galen, and Bandini in his Catalogue of the Laurentian Library says of him: 'Fu dei piu distinti discepoli d'Angelo Poliziano, tanto che nel 1497, assai giovane, scrisse e recitó nel duomo di Firenze l'orazione inaugurale per la solenne riapertura del pubblico studio e piu che fece stampare a' Giunta non pochi autori Greci e Latini.'

Franceso Accolti was no doubt the same person whom Bembo in a letter to Bibbiena, dated April 19, 1516, speaks of as dancing attendance at Urbino upon the Duchess Dowager and the Lady Emilia and professing to the former lady that he had been in love with her for five lustres and a half. According to the morals of that time a Bishop elect might thus conduct himself without blame. At all events the dedication seems to imply that Francesco Accolti had some interest at the court of Urbino. Perhaps also Giuliano dei Medici, who had been sheltered at Urbino in troubled times by the Duke Francesco Maria and who was himself distinguished for his love of letters, was induced to exert his powerful influence with the Duke, who, as matters then stood, could not well refuse anything to one of the Medici. Giuliano died on the 17th of March following; the troops of Leo invaded the duchy, and entered Urbino on the 30th of May. On the 18th of August Lorenzo, the Pope's nephew, was made Duke of Urbino in place of the deposed Francesco Maria. Thus the precious manuscript was borrowed, and in consequence of the troubles which followed, neither restored nor reclaimed.

This is more probable than that it was restored and subsequently stolen from the watchful guardianship which in peaceful times protected the library of Urbino. At all events this was not one of the hundred and sixty-five Greek MSS. which were in the library when it was transferred to the Vatican by Alexander VII., in the year 1658.

How and when the MS. came into the Library of Urbino are questions as obscure as how and when it was carried away.

Duke Federigo, the founder of the library, commenced making his collection of books about the middle of the 15th century. He spared, we are told, no pains or cost in securing MSS. either in Italy or abroad, and he had 30 or 40 persons employed as copyists. Vespasiano, of Florence, who was one of his agents, writing about the year 1463, gives a list of the authors whose works were then in Federigo's collection. Of the Greek classics he mentions Aristotle, Plato, Homer, Sophocles, Pindar, Menander, Plutarch, Ptolemy, Herodotus, Pausanias, Thucydides, Polybius, Demosthenes, Æschines, Plotinus, Theophrastus, Hippocrates, Galen, and Xenophon; but Aristophanes is not named. (Dennistoun's *Dukes of Urbino,* Vol. I.

p. 158; Zanelli, *La Biblioteca Vaticana*, ch. v.) We may therefore conclude that the MS. had not then been acquired.

It may have been added to the library subsequently either by Federigo or by Guidobaldo I., who succeeded in 1482 and died in 1508. The latter was also an accomplished scholar and conversed with fluency in Greek, but Aristophanes is not mentioned in the list of his favourite authors given by Castiglione (Dennistoun, *Dukes of Urbino*, Vol. II. p. 81). His youthful and warlike successor Francesco Maria della Rovere had probably no more inclination than money to spare for making additions to the library, at least during the early years of his reign. The MS. was therefore in all likelihood brought to Urbino not later than 1508. On the other hand if it had existed in a library so well-managed and so liberally thrown open to students as was that of Urbino before the year 1498, the date of the first Aldine edition, Aldus himself could scarcely have failed to be aware of its contents[1]. On the whole therefore I conclude that it was added by Guidobaldo to his collection between 1498 and 1508, probably during the comparatively tranquil years which followed his restoration to his Dukedom in 1503. It had a brief sojourn there, having been borrowed, as we have seen, in 1515 and in all probability never returned. That the *Thesmophoriazusæ* and *Lysistrate* published by Bernard Junta early in 1516 were printed directly from the Ravenna MS., and not from any transcript of it, is to my mind clear from internal evidence by a comparison of the texts. In the MS. itself I noticed a curious confirmation of the fact. Faint pencil marks have been drawn across the text, corresponding with the pagination in the Juntine edition, with (so far as I observed) only one exception, and that was when the unusual length of two lines had deranged the calculation. I noticed also on one page of the MS. a printer's black thumb-mark.

I mentioned before that in these two plays the MS. had been corrected by at least one later hand not found in the rest of the volume, and chiefly employed in inserting the names of the interlocutors omitted by the original writer. These inser-

[1] The great Duke and the great printer were on friendly terms. Aldus dedicated to Guidobaldo his editions of Thucydides and Xenophon.

tions are made in a reddish ink and are due as I believe to two different hands, the later corrector having used an ink like but not identical with the ink of the former, and also having imitated his hand.

In the Royal Library at Munich, among the books which formerly belonged to the Fugger family, the great merchant princes of Augsburg, is a MS., numbered 492 in the catalogue, eight inches long by six wide, on good paper, containing, *inter alia*, the *Thesmophoriazusæ* and *Lysistrate*. The writing seemed to me to belong to the early part of the 15th century, and M. Halm, the eminent librarian, whom I consulted, agreed with me as to the date. On the binding inside are the words *ἰωάννου τοῦ μοϊβάνου εἶμι* (*sic*), indicating doubtless the name of its possessor previously to its acquisition by the Fuggers[1].

I have no doubt that this MS. is a transcript of the Codex Ravennas, made by some one who had pretensions to scholarship and therefore ventured on emendations, while he was not so accurate in mere transcription as an ordinary copyist would have been. If I am not mistaken the transcript was made from the Ravenna MS. after it had been corrected by the earlier of the two hands I have spoken of, and before it had been corrected by the later. The earlier corrector may have been the writer of the Munich MS., the later, the editor employed by Bernard Junta. The selection of these two plays by the copyist shews that he was aware that they were not found in the ordinary MSS. of Aristophanes. The writer was probably a Greek, one of those who were induced to turn their attention to the copying or commenting of the ancient authors, because the newly awakened enthusiasm of the west had made it a profitable trade. The paper itself seems to be of Italian manufacture, but this does not militate against my hypothesis, because from the middle of the fourteenth century paper imported from Italy seems throughout the Greek empire to have superseded the inferior paper manufactured at home.

W. G. CLARK.

[1] The wrong accent on *εἶμι* seems to show that the owner of the name was not a Greek. The name is probably to be translated 'Giovanni di Bevagna.' About this 'John of Bevagna' I have not been able to find anything in our University Library, even with the assistance of Mr Bradshaw.

NOTES ON THUCYDIDES AND THE ACHARNIANS OF ARISTOPHANES.

Thucydides, i. 68.

νῦν δὲ τί δεῖ μακρηγορεῖν, ὧν τοὺς μὲν δεδουλωμένους ὁρᾶτε τοῖς δ' ἐπιβουλεύοντας αὐτοὺς καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα τοῖς ἡμετέροις ξυμμάχοις.

Arnold gives *ὑμετέροις* in his critical note as the reading of one MS. This, though unnoticed by other editors, seems far preferable in sense, and the confusion between the two pronouns in MSS. is frequent. It is a more telling argument for the Corinthians to urge before the Lacedaemonians that "the Athenians are plotting especially against *your* allies" than "they are plotting against *our* allies." And the whole question is of wrongs done to Hellas and to the confederacy (*ξυμμαχία*) of which the Spartans, not the Corinthians, were the head. To urge wrongs done specially to Corinthian allies seems out of place. And in the next chapter those on whom the Athenians are encroaching are again mentioned, and the Lacedaemonians charged with being virtually their oppressors, thus: *τῶν δὲ ὑμεῖς αἴτιοι...ἐς τόδε ἀεὶ ἀποστεροῦντες οὐ μόνον τοὺς ὑπ' ἐκείνων δεδουλωμένους ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὑμετέρους ἤδη ξυμμάχους.*

Thucydides, i. 84.

ἀεὶ δὲ ὡς πρὸς εὖ βουλευομένους τοὺς ἐναντίους ἔργῳ παρασκευαζόμεθα· καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἐκείνων ὡς ἁμαρτησομένων ἔχειν δεῖ τὰς ἐλπίδας, ἀλλ' ὡς ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἀσφαλῶς προνοουμένων.

It is strange that nearly all editors have preferred *παρασκευαζώμεθα*, interpreting it as *παρασκευάζεσθαι δεῖ*. The ear-

lier part of the chapter has described by a series of indicatives (*οἰκ ἐξυβρίζομεν—οὐκ ἐπαιρόμεθα—εὔβουλοι γιγνόμεθα*) the *actual* conduct and character of the Peloponnesians. Archidamus then proceeds "And in action we always prepare against our opponents on the supposition that they are taking wise counsel: and we do not need to ground our hopes on their presumed blunders, but on our own secure foresight." Göller keeps *παρασκευαζόμεθα*, but does not shew how the following *οὐ...δεῖ* is to be understood.

THUCYDIDES, I. 141.

οἱ τοιοῦτοι οὔτε ναῦς πληροῦντες οὔτε πεζὰς στρατιὰς πολλάκις ἐκπέμπειν δύνανται, ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων τε ἅμα ἀπόντες καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν δαπανῶντες.

Nearly all editions have *ἀπὸ τῶν αὑτῶν* without comment. Poppo has *αὐτῶν*, but in his note says "vulgo *αὑτῶν*, quo ambiguitas evitatur." Other passages support *αὑτῶν* as Thucydidean Greek (though Biggs says that Thucydides uses *τὰ αὑτῶν* here only), but the distinction or variation "their private possessions," "their own possessions," is unmeaning. *τῶν αὐτῶν* on the contrary yields the very sense wanted. "The Peloponnesians are workers of their own land (*αὐτουργοὶ*) and have no foreign possessions" says Pericles; "their resources are all at home: such a nation cannot send out fleets or armies often, since they have at one and the same time to be away from their own property and yet to draw their expenses from the same." The land and property at home must deteriorate by the absence of the cultivators, and yet this same must supply the sinews of war. The advantage which the Athenians on the contrary had in their foreign possessions is set forth later in this speech by Pericles, and by Archidamus in Thuc. I. 81.

ARISTOPHANES, *Acharn.* 988.

...ταί τ' ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον ἅμα καὶ μεγάλα δὴ φρονεῖ,
τοῦ βίου δ' ἐξέβαλε δεῖγμα τάδε τὰ πτερὰ προτῶν θυρῶν.

The amount of words lost here must be the equivalent of *εἶδες ὦ εἶδες ὦ* in v. 971, and the general sense appears to be rightly given by the scholiast: *Δικαιόπολις ἐπείγει, σπεύδει,*

σπουδάζει περὶ τὸ δεῖπνον. Hence Meineke (in his *Vindiciae*) proposes οὑτοσὶ δ' ἐπτόηταί τ' ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ., which seems better than Bergk's εἶδες ὦ τόνδ'; ἐπείγει περὶ κ.τ.λ. But Meineke goes on to say "recentissima aetate Henricus van Herwerden indicavit Aristophanis locum in Rav. sic scriptum legi ἐπτέρωταί τ' ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον, quod sane mirum est Bekkeri oculos fugisse." If the Ravenna manuscript does contain this, the lacuna is half supplied: for the rest we might take Meineke's οὑτοσὶ δ', or read εἶδες οἷ' ἐπτ. But any way ἐπτέρωται even as a conjectural emendation suits the passage well: "see you how he is all in a flutter (eager, excited) for the feast?" Similar uses of πτεροῦσθαι, ἀναπτεροῦσθαι are referred to by the lexicons; and especially to the point is the play on the various senses of πτεροῦν, ἀναπτεροῦν in Aristophanes' *Birds*, vv. 1436—1445:

Σ. ὦ δαιμόνιε μὴ νουθέτει μ' ἀλλὰ πτέρου.
Π. νῦν τοι λέγων πτερῶ σε. Σ. καὶ πῶς ἂν λόγοις
ἄνδρα πτερώσειας σύ; Π. πάντες τοι λόγοις
ἀναπτεροῦνται. Σ. πάντες; Π. οὐκ ἀκήκοας
ὅταν λέγωσιν οἱ πατέρες ἑκάστοτε
τοῖς φυλέταις ἐν τοῖσι κουρείοις ταδί;
δεινῶς γέ μου τὸ μειράκιον Διιτρέφης
λέγων ἀνεπτέρωκεν ὥσθ' ἱππηλατεῖν.
ὁ δέ τις τὸν αὑτοῦ φησὶν ἐπὶ τραγῳδίᾳ
ἀνεπτερῶσθαι καὶ πεποτῆσθαι τὰς φρένας.

This use of ἀναπτεροῦσθαι in Aristophanes (and the passage shews it to have been a common one at Athens) recommends ἐπτέρωται as a good verb to fill the gap in the line of the *Acharnians*. Nor need the occurrence of πτερὰ in the next line offend. For even if it be thought that it suggests a weak, alliterative sort of pun, Aristophanes is so often guilty in this kind, that it is scarcely an objection.

W. C. GREEN.

NOTES ON THE SUPPLICES OF ÆSCHYLUS.

Æsch. *Suppl.* 336.

τίς δ' ἂν φίλους ὠνοῖτο τοὺς κεκτημένους;

I cannot see that Boissonade's conjecture ὄνοιτο is preferable to the reading of the MSS., which Dindorf retains, provided that a proper explanation be given to the word φίλους. If φίλους be understood as in Hom. *Il.* III. 163,

ὄφρα ἴδῃ πρότερόν τε πόσιν πηούς τε φίλους τε,

where πηοί are Helen's relatives by marriage and φίλοι her blood-relations, the meaning will be: 'But who would purchase relatives as possessors?' *i.e.* 'Who would give anything for a relative as a husband?' To this the king replies:

σθένος μὲν οὕτω μεῖζον αὔξεται βροτοῖς,

which Mr Paley rightly explains: '*hoc modo*, nempe consociandis familiis non modo propinquitatis, sed etiam nuptiarum vinculo, *magis valent homines*.' The chorus answers:

καὶ δυστυχούντων γ' εὐμαρὴς ἀπαλλαγή,

where again I am quite ready to accept Mr Paley's explanation: 'Mihi ita videtur intelligenda. *Imo et si iis* (*sc.* maritis) *res male evadant, haud multum morantur divortium; h. e.* facilius a cognatis sanguine uxoribus quam ab aliis discessuri sunt si velint mariti: propinquos enim non punient propinqui.'

Thus, with the reading of the MSS. ὠνοῖτο, all is connected, whereas a disturbing element is introduced by the emendation ὄνοιτο, which, though equally good as regards the preceding question of the king:

πότερα κατ' ἔχθραν ἢ τὸ μὴ θέμις λέγεις;

is utterly foreign to the argument that follows.

For *φίλοι* in the sense of blood-relations, compare also Æsch. *Ag.* 1219. *παῖδες θανόντες ὡσπερεὶ πρὸς τῶν φίλων.*

Æsch. *Suppl.* 455.

πολλῶν ἄκουσον τέρματ' αἰδοίων λόγων.

I cannot agree with Mr Paley and Mr Linwood that *αἰδοίων* here means 'respectful.' The 'finale of many *respectful* words' was a threat on the part of the chorus to hang themselves, which appears to me anything but *respectful*. For my own part I understand *αἰδοίων* as appealing to the *αἰδώς* due to suppliants, and as implying a claim on protection:

'Hear the finale of many *protection-claiming* arguments.'

Ζεὺς *αἰδοῖος* in 192 is surely Zeus, who presides over *αἰδώς*, and thus is practically equivalent to Ζεὺς *ἀφίκτωρ* in line 1.

Æsch. *Suppl.* 461.

εἰμή τι πιστὸν τῷδ' ὑποστήσει στόλῳ.

I regret that Mr Paley has introduced *ὑποστήσεις, suggeres,* in the place of *ὑποστήσει, promittes.* What can be more natural and suitable than that the chorus should say: 'Unless you make some reliable promise to this band, we shall do so and so'?

Æsch. *Suppl.* 1018—1049.

This chorus is composed of pure Ionic *a minore* lines varied by or interspersed with lines or phrases, in which an *ἀνάκλασις* takes place. It is my purpose to endeavour to show that two emendations, made and generally accepted for the purpose of restoring the metre, have really been prejudicial to it.

I think it will not be disputed, that a metrical phrase, in which an anaclasis takes place, must necessarily be equivalent in temporal value and ultimately reducible to the corresponding normal phrase, in which the metre appears without the anaclasis. I think too that I may assume that, when the phrase in which the anaclasis is found occurs at regular intervals, it concludes the stanza, to which it gives an agreeable variety, much as the *versus parœmiacus* in the otherwise monotonous anapæstic system. Thus the conclusion of the synaphea of the system will always coincide with that of the anaclastic phrase,

and the last syllable, whether long or short, will always have to be considered as possessing the proper value of the last syllable in the pure or normal phrase.

Let us first consider the lines or phrases, in which the anaclasis occurs, in which there is no doubt as to the reading, and then apply the principles thence obtained to the settlement of the metre and reading of the disputed passages.

In line 1025 we have:

ἐχέτω μήδ' | ἔτι Νείλου | προχοὰς σέβωμεν ὕμνοις.

In order to reduce the latter half of this line to the Ionic *a minore* (or Anacreontic) metre, we have merely to reckon half the long syllable *βω* in *σέβωμεν* to the first and half to the second Ionic foot in the phrase, thus:

πρŏχŏᾶς σĕβω̆ | βω̄ μĕν ῡμνοῖς.
2 2

Similarly in line 1033;

γάμος ἔλθοι | Κυθερείας | στυγερὸν πέλει τόδ' ἄθλον,

we obtain two Ionic *a minore* feet by dividing *ει* in *πέλει* between them, thus:

στῠγĕρῶν πĕλεῐ | λεῐ τŏδ' ᾱθλῶν.
2 2

In line 1033 we have:

ψĕδῠρᾱ τρῐβοῐ | βοῐ τ' ĕρῶτῶν.
2 2

And in line 1051:

πρŏτĕρᾱν πĕλοῐ | λοῐ γῠναῐκῶν.
2 2

Let us now consider the disputed and emended lines.

Line 1021 stands in the MSS. *περιναίετε παλαιόν*, which does not make up two Ionic *a minore* feet. This is given by Mr Paley in his first edition *περιναίεται παλαιόν*, an emendation, which satisfies the requirements indicated above, but necessitates the alteration of *οἳ* in the preceding line into *οἷς*. In his second edition Mr Paley (after Hermann) reads *πĕρῐνᾱῐῶν | ταῖ πᾰλαῐῶν |*, which gives the value of a short syllable too much, unless the *ον* of *παλαιὸν* be reckoned short, which I do not think it can be at the conclusion of a system.

For my own part, taking into consideration the phenomena exhibited by the *Attis* of Catullus, where an effect almost

identical with that of an anaclasis is frequently produced by the simple resolution of the last long syllable of an Ionic foot, *e.g.* cĕlĕrī rătĕ | mărĭā |, and considering how easily the article τὸ may have been absorbed by a preceding τε, I venture to propose to read:

πέρἴναἰĕτĕ | τὄ πᾰλᾱἰον.

Indeed I think that the insertion of the article will be found an improvement to the sense and spirit of the passage:

ἴτε μὰν ἀσ|τυάνακτας | μάκαρας θεοὺς | γανάοντες |
πολιούχους | τε καὶ οἳ χεῦμ' | Ἐρασίνου |
περιναίετε | τὸ παλαιόν.

The other disputed passage is the corresponding line of the antistrophe (1036), where the MSS. give,

τόδε μελίσσοντες οὖδας,

which scans at once in accordance with the above principles, as follows:

τŏδĕ μĕλĭσσŏντ | ŏντĕς οῡδᾱς,
2 2

whereas the generally accepted emendation,

τŏδĕ μειλῑσσ|ōντĕς οῡδᾱς,

gives the value of a short syllable too much, unless the ας of οὖδας be reckoned short at the end of the system.

I must not however conceal that, whether accidentally or not, the other anaclastic phrases do not afford any clue to the solution of the question as to the quantity of the last syllable of an anaclastic phrase, as they all end with syllables either long in themselves or made long by a consonant commencing the next line. Against this doubtful point I have to set (1) the reduction of the number of emendations from two to one, (2) the greater inherent probability of my emendation, which inserts a syllable easily absorbed or lost, but alters nothing, (3) the close analogy of the manner in which I explain the phrases in question with the phenomena of the undoubtedly authentic anaclastic phrases, (4) the improbability of the introduction of so very different a movement, as a ditrochaic, in an Ionic system, and (5) the analogy of the *Attis* of Catullus.

Every line of the *Attis* of Catullus is similarly reducible to an Ionic *a minore* tetrameter catalectic upon the principles,

(1) That each line is divided into two halves, which never run into each other.

(2) That each half-line is made up of syllables equivalent in temporal value and reducible to two Ionic feet, the last half-verse in each line being catalectic.

(3) That no liberty is ever taken with any syllable but the first in the 2nd and 4th feet of any line.

(4) That the last syllable in every line is always considered long. For example:

Sŭpĕr āltă vĕct | vĕctŭs Āttīs || cēlērī rătĕ | mărĭā.
2 2

Jām Jām dŏlĕt | lĕt quŏd ēgī || jām jāmquĕ poĕ | poĕnĭtēt.
2 2 2 2

N.B. In the last line above quoted the Ionic *a minore* is replaced in the 1st and 3rd feet by its inversion, the Ionic *a majore.*

Indeed the *Attis* of Catullus, the metre of which I have reduced to a very simple tabular form—six lines representing every variation—in my and the late Mr F. N. Sutton's *Selections from Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius,* presents phenomena so similar to those of the Chorus in the *Supplices* of Æschylus which I have been examining, that I think they may be fairly considered as not only illustrating, but actually explaining each other.

A. H. WRATISLAW.

ON THE ATHENIAN PROEDRI.

Few points connected with the political arrangements of the Athenians have given occasion to so much discussion as the regulations respecting the Proedri and Prytanes. A natural curiosity is felt to have the fullest possible information as to the mode of conducting business in the Athenian Boule and Ecclesia, while an exceptional interest attaches to this particular point from one of the most striking episodes in the life of Socrates—his conduct upon the occasion of the trial of the eight generals. The question is one which we may venture, even at the risk of repeating much that others have said before, to review, with the hope of adding something towards its elucidation.

The earlier enquirers into Athenian political antiquities drew most of their information from the Orators and from Grammarians, especially such of the latter as had written commentaries upon the Orators. It is obvious, however, that political phrases in Demosthenes or Æschines must often be understood as applying only to the state of things in their times; and as for later writers such as Harpocration or Libanius, valuable as they are when confirmed by other testimony, yet in many cases they have nothing to tell us beyond what they have thought to be employed by the authors they illustrate, or they quote second-hand from authorities they only half understand. It is not to be wondered at therefore if the statements of the Grammarians respecting the office of the Proedri are at variance with each other. The author of the second argument to Demosthenes' oration against Androtion has the following statement: ἦρχον οὖν οἱ πεντακόσιοι τὰς

τριακοσίας πεντήκοντα ἡμέρας. ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ πολλοὶ ἦσαν, καὶ δυσχερῶς ἤννυον τὰ πράγματα, διεῖλον ἑαυτοὺς εἰς δέκα μερίδας, κατὰ τὰς φυλὰς, ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα. τούτους γὰρ ἑκάστη φυλὴ προεβάλλετο. ὥστε συνέβαινε τοὺς πεντήκοντα ἄρχειν τῶν ἄλλων ἀνὰ τριάκοντα ἡμέρας. αὗται γὰρ αἱ τριάκοντα πέντε ἡμέραι εἰσὶ τὸ δωδέκατον μέρος τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ... ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ πάλιν οἱ πεντήκοντα πολλοὶ ἦσαν εἰς τὸ ἄρχειν ἅμα, οἱ δέκα, κατὰ κλῆρον μιᾶς ἡμέρας τῶν ἑπτὰ, ὁμοίως δὲ ἕκαστος τῶν ἄλλων ἀπὸ κλήρου ἦρχε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἡμέραν, ἄχρις οὗ πληρωθῶσιν αἱ ἑπτὰ ἡμέραι. καὶ συνέβαινε τοῖς ἄρχουσι τρεῖς μὴ ἄρχειν. ἕκαστος δὲ ἄρχων ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκαλεῖτο ἐπιστάτης..... ἰστέον δ' ὅτι οἱ μὲν πεντήκοντα ἐκαλοῦντο πρυτάνεις· οἱ δὲ δέκα πρόεδροι· ὁ δὲ εἷς ἐπιστάτης. It has been generally taken for granted that this gives an accurate account of the arrangements of the Prytanes and Proedri, at least as they stood in the times of Thucydides and Socrates; and as such it has passed into all the handbooks of Greek political antiquities. But other explanations by the Grammarians are to a different effect. Besides the fifty Prytanes of the πρυτανεύουσα φυλή, we hear of nine daily-appointed Proedri, one from each of the remaining tribes. Thus Pollux (VIII. 96. fin.) says:—ὅταν οἱ πρυτάνεις τὸν δῆμον ἢ τὴν βουλὴν συνάγωσιν, οὗτος (i.e. ὁ ἐπιστάτης τῶν πρυτάνεων) ἐξ ἑκάστης φυλῆς πρόεδρον ἕνα κληροῖ, μόνην τὴν πρυτανεύουσαν ἀφίεις· Suidas also (s.v. ἐπιστάτης) describes the same transaction in almost the same words. These statements, coming from writers who probably followed directly or indirectly the authority of Aristotle, are deserving of great weight. Nor is Harpocration (s.v. πρόεδροι) less explicit. Πρόεδροι ἐκληροῦντο τῶν πρυτάνεων καθ' ἑκάστην πρυτανείαν εἷς ἐξ ἑκάστης φυλῆς, πλὴν τῆς πρυτανευούσης, οἵτινες τὰ περὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν διῴκουν. ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ πρόεδροι, ἐπειδήπερ προήδρευον τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων. πολλάκις δ' ἔστι τοὔνομα παρὰ τοῖς ῥήτορσιν, ὡς καὶ παρὰ Δημοσθένει ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἀνδροτίωνος, καὶ Αἰσχίνῃ ἐν τῷ κατὰ Κτησιφῶντος. ὅτι δὲ ὁ καλούμενος ἐπιστάτης κληροῖ αὐτοὺς εἴρηκεν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ. Here πρυτανείαν in the first clause is by most critics altered to ἡμέραν, which is certainly the word which we should rather have expected to find, and ὑπό ought probably to be inserted before τῶν

πρυτάνεων[1]. If we leave the text as it stands we perhaps might construe as follows: "Proedri of the Prytanes (not 'from among the Prytanes,' which would obviously contradict the words that directly follow), were appointed by lot *during each prytany*, one from every tribe except the prytanising tribe." For we know from other sources (as we shall presently see), that the nine non-tribal[2] Proedri were chosen by lot daily, and held their office only during that portion of the day in which business was being transacted by the Senate or the Assembly.

But now the question arises, what was the precise relation in which these nine non-tribal Proedri and their Epistates stood towards the fifty Prytanes of the prytanising tribe? When and why came these nine non-tribal Proedri to be appointed at all? Again, what is to be said of the ten daily tribal Proedri of whom we learn from the author of the argument to the speech against Androtion?

The account which Mr Grote (Vol. III. p. 118 fol. 2nd ed.), following mainly Schömann (*De Comitiis*, Bk. I. ch. 7), has given, may be said to represent the popular view of the matter. It is an account in itself indeed sufficiently intelligible and probable. It is doubtful, however, whether it can be said to rest on sufficient documentary authority. On the other hand, Schömann himself, who is chiefly responsible for it, has seen reasons for changing his opinion[3], now that a more extended and careful examination of documentary evidence has thrown a different light on the matter. That evidence is twofold: 1st, that of authors contemporary with the institutions we are examining, such as Thucydides and the Orators: and 2nd, the evidence of contemporary Inscriptions. It can never be too often repeated in all questions of this kind, that the statements of Grammarians, valuable as they may be in connexion with other testimony, are as nothing compared with the authority

[1] See Schömann, *De Comitiis*, p. 85; and Meier, *De Epistatis*, p. iv.

[2] The earlier writers on this question used the terms *contribules* and *non-contribules*. (So Schömann, *De Com.*) But Meier with reason prefers the expressions *tribules* and *non-tribules*, which I have translated 'tribal' and 'non-tribal.'

[3] See his *Griechische Alterthümer*, Vol. I. p. 391.

of contemporaneous documents, whether of Authors or of Inscriptions.

First of all then we find in earlier writers no mention of Proedri whatever. Thus when Thucydides (VI. 14) introduces Nicias dissuading the people in the Ecclesia from the Sicilian expedition, he makes him thus address the President:—*καὶ σὺ, ὦ πρύτανι, ταῦτα (εἴπερ ἡγεῖ σοι προσήκειν κήδεσθαί τε τῆς πόλεως καὶ βούλει γενέσθαι πολίτης ἀγαθὸς) ἐπιψήφιζε καὶ γνώμας προτίθει αὖθις Ἀθηναίοις.* The obvious inference from this passage is that at this time the President of the Ecclesia (as also of course of the Boule) was one of the fifty senators of the *φυλὴ πρυτανεύουσα*; and further, that in his capacity as Epistates he had the sole power of putting questions to the vote (*ἐπιψηφίζειν*) and of submitting subjects for discussion. To the same effect is the narrative of Socrates' conduct in the assembly when the subject of debate was the conduct of the generals after the battle of Arginusæ[1]. Here, to add greater force to the argument, we are furnished with the twofold accounts of Xenophon and of Plato. *Ἔτυχεν ἡμῶν* (says the Platonic Socrates in the *Apology*, page 32 B) *ἡ φυλὴ Ἀντιοχὶς πρυτανεύουσα, ὅτε ὑμεῖς τοὺς δέκα στρατηγοὺς τοὺς οὐκ ἀνελομένους τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ναυμαχίας ἐβούλεσθε ἀθρόους κρίνειν.....τότ' ἐγὼ μόνος τῶν πρυτάνεων ἠναντιώθην ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.* To the same effect is the account given by Xenophon (*Memorabilia*, I. 1. 18). *Βουλεύσας γάρ ποτε, καὶ τὸν βουλευτικὸν ὅρκον ὀμόσας, ἐν ᾧ ἦν*

[1] Mr Grote (*Hist. of Greece*, Vol. v. p. 527, note) thinks it not absolutely certain that Socrates was Epistates, as this fact is asserted only in one passage of Xenophon. But even apart from this explicit statement, it is implied in the other passages which mention the occurrence. It is noticeable that in Thucydides (VI. 14) Nicias addresses the Epistates as *ὦ Πρύτανι*. The Epistates possessed his whole authority as Prytanis: *i.e.* as chairman he simply summed up in himself the the collective authority of the board of Prytanes. He was not an officer of state or a magistrate. His position might be compared with that of the Speaker in the House of Commons, or of the foreman of a jury. Hence it is that Socrates is spoken of as refusing to put the question rather in his character of Prytanis than of Epistates. But that he really was Epistates seems certain, both from the passages already quoted, and the following one from the *Gorgias*, 473 E, *πέρυσι βουλεύειν λαχών, ἐπειδὴ ἡ φυλὴ ἐπρυτάνευε καὶ ἔδει με ἐπιψηφίζειν, γέλωτα παρεῖχον καὶ οὐκ ἠπιστάμην ἐπιψηφίζειν.*

κατὰ τοὺς νόμους βουλεύσειν, ἐπιστάτης ἐν τῷ δήμῳ γενόμενος, ἐπιθυμήσαντος τοῦ δήμου παρὰ τοὺς νόμους ἐννέα (sic) στρατηγοὺς μιᾷ ψήφῳ τοὺς ἀμφὶ Θράσυλλον καὶ Ἐρασινίδην ἀποκτεῖναι πάντας, οὐκ ἠθέλησεν ἐπιψηφίσαι κ.τ.λ. Is not the obvious inference from these passages this: that, at the time when Socrates was a member of the βουλή, the President in meetings of the Senate and the Assembly was one of the fifty prytanes of the φυλὴ πρυτανεύουσα, chosen daily by lot, and having the power not only of putting but of refusing to put questions to the vote (ἐπιψηφίζειν)? But neither in Thucydides nor Plato nor Xenophon is any mention made of πρόεδροι. And the same thing may be said of the following passage of Antiphon (*De Chor.* p. 146, 37) quoted by Schömann (*De Comitiis*, p. 93 note), πρυτανεύσας τὴν πρώτην πρυτανείαν ἅπασαν πλὴν δυοῖν ἡμέραιν, καὶ ἱεροποιῶν καὶ θύων ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐπιψηφίζων καὶ λέγων γνώμας περὶ τῶν μεγίστων καὶ πλείστου ἀξίων τῇ πόλει φανερὸς ἦν. As far then as the writings of that period have come down to us, it may be said with apparent certainty that no mention is made of Proedri in any writer before the Archonship of Eucleides. The statement accordingly of the scholiast we first quoted receives from this a partial confirmation and a partial depreciation. He is certainly right in saying that the presidency of the Senate and the Assembly was held by an Epistates appointed daily by lot from among the fifty members of the πρυτανεύουσα φυλή. But of any subdivision of those fifty into five batches of Proedri we find not a word in confirmation. Certain it is that all the notices of the Prytany arrangements before the Anarchy are perfectly intelligible without supposing any such subdivision. Nay more, had so elaborate an arrangement existed, we should have expected to have it mentioned by name, or at least implied, in connexion with so interesting a story as that of Socrates' presidency.

The opinion we have been maintaining does not however depend merely upon this *argutum silentium* of contemporary writers, but receives also remarkable confirmation from inscriptions. Before the Archonship of Eucleides the regular introductory formula in Athenian ψηφίσματα is as follows. First is given the date, by mentioning the name of the Archon and

that of the Secretary to the first prytany of the year. Thus in Bœckh, *Corp. Inscr.* 74, we read:—Ἐπὶ Ἀψεύδους ἄρχοντος καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς βουλῆς ᾗ [ὁ δεῖνα] πρῶτος ἐγραμμάτευε. This heading is however frequently wanting from inscriptions that have come down to us. Next comes the decree itself, invariably introduced by the formula:—Ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ, Ἐρεχθηὶς ἐπρυτάνευε, Σκόπας ἐγραμμάτευε, Τιμωνίδης ἐπεστάτει, Διοπείθης εἶπεν. For examples of these formulæ one may refer to Bœckh, *Corp. Inscr.* 74, 81; Rangabé, *Antiquités Helléniques*, Vol. I. Nos. 250, 257, 259, 263—4, 294; Franz, *Elementa Epigraph. Græc.* p. 319. It will be seen then that in inscriptions of this period the President of the Senate and Assembly is always indicated by the phrase ὁ δεῖνα ἐπεστάτει, *i. e.* he is called ἐπιστάτης. That he was a member of the φυλὴ πρυτανεύουσα we already know from the passages cited above from Thucydides, Plato and Xenophon. In the inscriptions this latter point is not specified; the demotic name of the Epistates not being subjoined, as we shall find it to have been in the inscriptions of a later date. But the important thing to notice is, that no mention is anywhere made of Proedri, nor anything said to suggest the idea that the daily President was chosen out of any intermediate subdivision of the Senate other or less than the fifty members of the tribe then holding the prytany[1].

If now we proceed to examine the Athenian writers and inscriptions of the period succeeding the Archonship of Eucleides, an alteration will be observed to have taken place in these arrangements, and a corresponding change in the formulas and phrases relating thereto. It would be wasting time to quote passages to prove how continually the word πρόεδρος is used in the Orators. Passages like the following occur almost on every page:—Ἐκκλησία γίγνεται, ἐν ᾗ Δημοσθένης λαγχάνει προεδρεύειν (Æschin. *Fals. Leg.* 259). Ἀναστὰς ἐκ τῶν προέδρων

[1] Since writing the above, I find that as early as 1843 C. F. Hermann had contended against the existence of Proedri before the Archonship of Eucleides. (*Epicrisis de proedris apud Athenienses*, Gottingen, 1843.) The opinion is however worth reasserting now, from the additional force lent to the argument by the very numerous inscriptions discovered and published within the last twenty-five years. Schömann (*Griechische Alterth.* Vol. I. p. 391) and Meier (*De Epistatis*, p. iv.) also adopt the same conclusion.

Δημοσθένης οὐκ ἔφη τὸ ψήφισμα ἐπιψηφιεῖν (*ib.* 260). Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ δῆμῳ προήδρευε τούτου τοῦ μῆνος ἑβδόμῃ φθίνοντος, (*ib.* 268.) Οἱ προεδρεύοντες τῆς βουλῆς καὶ ὁ ταὐτ' ἐφίψηφίζων ἐπιστάτης (*Dem. adv. Androt.* 596). In these and similar cases it is impossible not to identify these πρόεδροι with the nine non-tribal proedri described by Pollux and the other Grammarians, and the Epistates with the president daily chosen by lot from among these nine. Still as Schömann says (*De Comitiis*, p. 87 note) although these passages tend to such a conclusion yet they cannot be said to prove the point distinctly. What further proof however is wanting is abundantly supplied by inscriptions. From them it may be demonstrated first of all that the Epistates of the Proedri in the time of the Orators was invariably of a different tribe from that which held the prytany. The number of Athenian decrees which have come down to us from the period between the Archonship of Eucleides and the times of the Diadochi is so large that ample illustration is at hand. One need but refer to Bœckh's *Corpus Inscriptionum*, Vol. I. or to Rangabé's *Antiquités Helléniques*, Nos. 376—674. Thus for example the decree published in Bœckh, *Corpus Inscr.* 105, is headed as follows:—Ἐπὶ Νικοδώρου Ἄρχοντος, ἐπὶ τῆς Κεκροπίδος ἕκτης πρυτανείας, Γαμηλιῶνος ἐνδεκάτῃ, ἕκτῃ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας, ἐκκλησία· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφιζεν[1] Ἀριστοκράτης Ἀριστοδήμου Οἰναῖος καὶ συμπρόεδροι, Θρασυλλῆς Ναυσιστράτου Θριάσιος εἶπεν, κ.τ.λ. (See the commentary of Bœckh ad loc.). Here then the Epistates of the Proedri is of one of the Demos Οἰνόη, and therefore of the tribe Hippothoontis or Æantis, whereas the φυλὴ πρυτανεύουσα is Cecropis. The same thing is observable in the other decrees of this date: in all, where the stone is sufficiently entire for us to recover the heading, the Epistates is found to be of some tribe other than that which is holding the prytany. Further, after the mention of the Epistates there follows invariably the phrase καὶ συμπρόεδροι, which M. Ran-

[1] The right reading of the stone here (as in *C. I.* 97. l. 5) is the imperfect and not the aorist. The imperfect occurs in all inscriptions I have examined, and the testimony of Rangabé (*Antiquités Helléniques*) is to the same effect.

gabé rightly translates 'un tel et ses collègues mettaient aux voix.' The Epistates and his brother Proedri are classed together as on the same footing. It seem implied that as he was one of the non-prytanising tribes, so also was each one of them. In other words we have here an illustration of the statements of Pollux and others, quoted above, respecting the nine non-tribal Proedri. But we are not left to be content with this presumption alone. There happen to have come down to us several inscriptions in which, by a slight amplification of the customary formula, after the words *τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφιζεν ὁ δεῖνα καὶ συμπρόεδροι*, there follows a list of the other eight *συμπρόεδροι* with their respective demotic names appended. This was first noticed by Bœckh in the *Corpus Inscr.* No. 111, where he shews how the Epistates and *συμπρόεδροι* are each members of a different tribe, i.e. of each of the tribes save *φυλὴ πρυτανεύουσα*. As that inscription is posterior to the institution of twelve tribes (B.C. 306), accordingly the *συμπρόεδροι* are ten in number, the Epistates making an eleventh. It is sufficient to refer the reader to Bœckh's lucid commentary upon this document. We may with more advantage turn to one or two other inscriptions bearing on the point, which do not seem to have been sufficiently noticed. Bœckh on *Corpus Inscr.* 111, says of the enumeration of the *συμπρόεδροι*, 'additi hoc loco erant reliqui proedri, quod nusquam alibi repperi.' A parallel example has since been published by Rangabé, *Antiquités Helléniques*, No. 427. Unfortunately the stone is much mutilated; but what remains is a valuable illustration of our subject. Lines 10 to 14 contain only proper names; and as M. Rangabé says, judging by the original length of the lines, they cannot have contained more than ten names at the most. We shall see that as the inscription was anterior to the establishment of the twelve tribes, no more than ten names are wanted. M. Rangabé arranges them as follows:

1. *ὁ ἐπιψηφίζων*, (l. 9.)
2. Wholly lost, (l. 9—10.)
3. *Θυμοχάρης* Νε ... (l. 10.)
4. .....Κυδαθηναιεύς, (l. 11.)
5. Εὐεσ.....(l. 11.)

6. ..... ος Κεφαλῆθεν, (l. 12.)
7. Ε.....'Ελευσίνιος, (l. 12—13.)
8. Νικι ..... (l. 13.)
9. ..... ης 'Αριστάρχου ..... (l. 14.)
10. Wholly lost. (l. 14—15.)

The last name is immaterial, as it was merely that of the mover of the decree (*ὁ δεῖνα εἶπεν*). The remaining nine names may be shewn to be those of the nine non-tribal Proedri. It is well known that whenever the Attic tribes were enumerated in public documents the following fixed order of precedence obtained—Erechtheis, Ægeis, Pandionis, Leontis, Acamantis, Œneis, Cecropis, Hippothontis, Æantis, Antiochis. Now in the decree before us the fourth person on the list is of the Deme Cydathenæi, in other words of the tribe Pandionis: the sixth is of the Deme Cephale, *i.e.* of the tribe Acamantis: the seventh is of Eleusis, *i.e.* of the tribe Hippothontis. The Epistates would of course be mentioned first, whatever his tribe might be: the third therefore of the *συμπρόεδροι* is naturally cited as being of the tribe which is third in order of precedence, and the fifth as the fifth tribe. Can we do wrong in assuming that the first, the second and the fourth of the *συμπρόεδροι* were respectively of the tribes Erechtheis, Ægeis, Leontis? The sixth *συμπρόεδρος* however is of Hippothontis, the eighth tribe. But let us suppose that of the two tribes omitted, *i.e.* Œneis and Cecropis, the sixth and seventh, one was the tribe of the Epistates, the other the *φυλὴ πρυτανεύουσα*. There is nothing then to prevent our assigning the seventh and eighth of the *συμπρόεδροι* to the tribes Æantis and Antiochis. This document then, read in connexion with *Corpus Inscr.* No. 111, strongly establishes the correctness of the statements by Pollux and Suidas respecting the Proedri—that they were nine in number, one from each of the nine tribes not enjoying the prytany.

The mutilated fragment published by Bœckh, *Corp. Inscr.* 97, also presents some similarity to No. 111. After the words [*τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφ*]*ιζεν* [*ὁ δεῖνα καὶ συ*]*μπρόε*[*δροι*] (l. 5—7) there follows in lines 7—12 nothing but the remains of proper names. Five are portions of demotic names, *-κίδης*, *-ιεύς*, *'Αχαρν-*, *Φλυεύ-*, *-φλύστιο-*. Of these only the last three can be

identified; viz. Ἀχαρνεύς, Φλυεύς, Ἀναφλύστιος, Demes belonging to the tribes Æneis, Cecropis, Antiochis respectively. One would feel tempted to consider this a list of *συμπρόεδροι* but for the fact that the proper tribal order is not observed. If however this be not an insuperable objection, and this be really a list of *πρόεδροι* (the lacunas would just suit that number of names), then they were certainly non-tribal.

It is therefore certain in every way that in the days of Thucydides and Socrates the presidency of the Senate and Assembly was held by the fifty senators of the *φυλὴ πρυτανεύουσα* with their *ἐπιστάτης*. It is equally certain that by the time of Demosthenes and earlier this arrangement was altered, and that the chairman of the Boule and Ecclesia was an Epistate chosen by lot from among nine *πρόεδροι*, themselves daily chosen by lot from each of the non-prytanising tribes.

When did this change take place? This has been found a hard question to answer. Schömann (*De Comit.* ch. vii.) assigns the new arrangement to no particular date, but seems to think the non-tribal Proedri whenever instituted did not till after B. C. 307 acquire the privilege of putting questions to the vote. Bœckh however (in *Corp. Inscr.* 90) points out that in B. C. 314 the *ἐπιψηφίζων* is not a Prytanis (comp. *Corp. Inscr.* 105); nay that in B. C. 332 the change must have already taken place, from Æschines' words (*In Ctes.* 385), *καὶ ταῦτα ἕτεροί τινες τὰ ψηφίσματα ἐπιψηφίζουσιν, οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ δικαιοτάτου τρόπου λάχοντες προεδρεύειν, ἀλλ' ἐκ παρασκευῆς καθεζόμενοι. ἂν δέ τις τῶν ἄλλων βουλευτῶν* (not *πρυτάνεων*) *ὄντως λάχῃ κληρούμενος προεδρεύειν, κ.τ.λ.* This description says Bœckh, suits not the Prytanes, but the nine Proedri "qui—in unum comitiorum vel senatus diem tumultuaria haud dubie sortitione constituuntur; ut facile aliquis in hanc unius diei proedriam irrepere potuerit." Further Æschines, just after this (p. 387), distinguishes the Proedri from the Prytanes; *οὔθ' οἱ πρυτανεῖς, οὔθ' οἱ πρόεδροι.* Bœckh in accordance with Schömann (*Ibid* p. 92) thinks the *ἐπιψηφίζων* in B. C. 347 is still a tribal Prytanis; he would place the change in question somewhere about Ol. 109—111 (B. C. 344—333). Schömann since then, in his *Antiquitates Juris Publici Græcorum* (p. 222, note 4) expresses himself as so

well satisfied with this argument of Bœckh that he is willing to think the story of Demosthenes being Epistates upon two successive days (Æsch. *In Ctes.* p. 463), if not the mere libel of a political assailant, must be taken as an example of the underhand management of the sortition, which as Bœckh says (in the passage quoted above) was very possible. The change from Prytanes to Proedri may therefore be placed earlier: and indeed the evidence of inscriptions necessitates such a conclusion.

Meier (*De Epistatis Atheniensium, Index Scholarum.* Halæ. 1855) would place the change between Ol. 100. 3, and Ol. 102. 4, (B.C. 378—369). He carefully examines the epigraphical evidence on the question, and considers that whenever the expression *ὁ δεῖνα ἐπεστάτει* occurs on an inscription it must refer to the self-same officer, viz. the chairman of the fifty tribal Prytanes. The latest document on which he can find this formula belongs to B. C. 378. The earliest on which he finds the formula *τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφιζεν* belongs to B.C. 369. And if occasionally (as in No. 61 of Meier, *Comment. Epigraph.*) the Epistates is of a different tribe from the *φυλὴ πρυτανεύουσα,* he would consider this arrangement as merely temporary. The same jealousy of the prytanising tribe which led afterwards to the institution of non-tribal Proedri, may, he thinks, before that time have caused the appointment of a non-tribal Epistates to preside over the tribal Prytanes. (Meier, *ib.* p. vii.)

The authority of a scholar like Meier must command deserved weight upon any question relating to Athenian Antiquities. Yet it would surely seem that the opinion just mentioned is to a high degree improbable; and I think it may also be proved contrary to the testimony of Inscriptions. To take an example. In Rangabé (*ib.* No. 386) the heading of the decree runs as follows: [Ἐπὶ Χαρ]ικλείδου ἄρχ[ον]τος, *ἐπὶ τῆς* Ἀκαμαντίδος δευτέρας πρυτανευούσης ᾗ Νικόστρατος Φ ..... Παλληνεὺς ἐγραμμάτευεν, τριακοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας. Ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ ..... λης Παιανιεὺς ἐπεστάτει, Κράτης εἶπεν. κ.τ.λ. Now the Pæanian Deme we know to have belonged to the tribe Pandionis. The Epistates accordingly is of a different tribe from the *φυλὴ πρυτανεύουσα.* One thing is to be especially remarked in this decree. Of the Archon's name

there remain the letters ..... ικλείδου. Now there are two Archons only in the Fasti who fulfil this condition, viz. Phrasicleides, B. C. 371, and Charicleides, B. C. 363. M. Rangabé for various good reasons prefers the later Archon. In either case the date is not very far removed from the Archonship of Eucleides, and it is noticeable that the formula bears a strong resemblance to that which was said above to be usual in Inscriptions anterior to Eucleides. But is the Epistates here mentioned the president of the tribal Prytanes, though himself of a different tribe, or is he the president of the nine non-tribal Proedri? The former is the view of Meier. With deference to his authority I think it untenable.

I have collected some examples from Rangabé, *Antiq. Hellén.* of the use of the old and the new formulas in decrees as close as possible to the Archonship of Eucleides. The later formula occurs in the following:

No. 393.....date B. C. 357
... 377 392
... 376 ..... 399 (probable date).

We find the older formula retained in the following:

No. 381 (page 375).....B. C. 378
... 2296..... 377
... 385 372
... 386..... 371 or 363
... 786 362
... 397 ..... 349 (probable date).
... 401 ..... 347.

It appears from this list that the old formula was not, as Meier's view would imply, at a precise date superseded by the newer one: but on the contrary that for some time the two were used indiscriminately. So that the date of the change from Prytanes to Proedri must be fixed from other indications than the employment of these formulas.

C. F. Hermann, in his *Political Antiquities of the Greeks*, (127. 9) makes the Archonship of Eucleides the date of this transition. This opinion receives strong confirmation from Inscriptions. No. 376 of Rangabé's *Antiq. Hellén.*, where the

Athenians crown one Thibron, is with extreme probability referred to the Lacedæmonian general of that name. If so, the inscription would belong to B. C. 399, and thus early would the institution of nine non-tribal Proedri have taken place. They are also mentioned in Rangabé, *ibid.* 377. This inscription is dated [Ἐπ]ὶ Φιλοκλέους ἄρχοντος. There were two Archons of the name, one B. C. 392 and one B. C. 322. But M. Rangabé for various reasons prefers the earlier date, which is strongly confirmed by the many traces of archaic orthography occurring in the document. Moreover upon this supposition all difficulty ceases respecting the inscription published in the Ἐφημερὶς Ἀρχαιολογική, No. 1627, which Meier himself quotes (Meier, *ibid.* p. vii.), candidly confessing that if correctly read by M. Pittakis it directly contradicts his theory.

To recapitulate then, we arrive at the following conclusions. Before the Archonship of Eucleides no Proedri were in existence at all, but the presidency in the Boule and Ecclesia belonged to the fifty Bouleutæ of the prytanising tribe, out of whose number daily was elected an Epistates by lot. After that date we find functions formerly enjoyed by the Prytanes transferred to nine Proedri, one from each of the tribes except that holding the prytany. These were chosen by lot at each meeting of the Boule or Ecclesia, and one of their number was further selected by lot to preside (ἐπιψηφίζειν). If we ask the precise date of this transfer, epigraphical evidence appears to point to the Archonship of Eucleides as most probable. And there are *a priori* considerations which tend to confirm this conclusion. In B. C. 403 the Athenian democracy had lately been rudely suspended by the bloody reign of the Thirty. The exiles who returned with Thrasybulus found all in disorder, and the most urgent efforts were needed, and were forthcoming, to restore the state after the anarchy from which it was emerging. The various boards who superintended the different departments of public affairs would naturally be invested, by the very necessity of the occasion, with larger powers than before. Thus, to take an example, whereas previously there had been two distinct boards of Treasurers, the one being οἱ ταμίαι τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῆς Ἀθηναίας, the other οἱ ταμίαι τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν, we find at

this time those two united into one board of ten men, one from each tribe, (see Bœckh on *Corp. Inscr.* 150, and Kirchhoff on the *ταμίαι τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν* in the *Abhandlungen* of the Berlin Academy, 1861). In a similar way, we may well conceive, it was thought that the fifty tribal Prytanes were at once too unwieldy and too exclusive a board to suit the needs of the occasion. A new board was required which should possess greater pliancy and activity by virtue of being smaller in the number of its members, and which by having a more representative character should command a more complete deference. Thus a board of nine from different tribes took the place of the fifty tribal Prytanes.

It appears that the old board of Prytanes with their Epistates continued still to exist, although its more important function of controlling the debates of Senate and Assembly was made over to its successor. It still retained its more formal functions, such as calling an assembly of the Ecclesia, and conducting the ballot for the Proedri. Aristotle is quoted by Harpocration (s.v. *Ἐπιστάτης*) as distinctly asserting the existence of two officers of state bearing at the same moment the title of Epistates. *Δύο εἰσὶν οἱ καθιστάμενοι ἐπιστάται· ὁ μὲν ἐκ πρυτανέων κληρούμενος. ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῶν προέδρων. ὧν ἑκάτερος τίνα διοίκησιν διοικεῖ, δεδήλωκεν ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ.* We may well regret, with Meier, that Harpocration did not deem it necessary to add what Aristotle said of the respective functions of the two. Still more must we lament the loss of Aristotle's *Πολιτεῖαι*, a treatise whose preservation would doubtless have rendered the discussion we have been engaged in wholly unnecessary.

E. L. HICKS.

THE SIXTH SATIRE OF PERSIUS.

THE question of the completeness of the Satires of Persius in their present form has been recently discussed by Mr Macleane and Mr Pretor. The text, which has occasioned the controversy, is furnished by the biography of the Poet. It is as follows: Hunc ipsum librum imperfectum reliquit. Versus aliqui dempti sunt ultimo libro, et quasi finiturus esset, leviter correxit Cornutus.

Upon this statement two theories have been founded, one of which branches into two varieties:—1. That of Jahn, who holds that the sixth Satire *is* complete in its present form, and that the biographer means that Cornutus cancelled the beginning of a seventh Satire, and so made the sixth close the series. 2. That of Mr Macleane and Mr Pretor, who hold that the sixth Satire is *not* complete. But Mr Macleane maintains, that it is *the end* of the Satire which is imperfect, and that Vende animam lucro, v. 75, begins a new branch of the subject, which is left unfinished. Mr Pretor, on the other hand, argues that the end is not the unfinished portion, but that the abruptness of the transitions in vv. 37, 41, 52 and 75, in particular, and, above all, two unexplained references in vv. 71 and 66 are proofs that the sixth Satire as we have it is a skeleton only, containing heads which Persius intended to work out. The words of the biographer, versus aliqui dempti sunt ultimo libro, mean that Persius' editor struck out unfinished lines, here and there, throughout the Satire, which thus presents a superficial completeness. From the negative theory in its two varieties I venture to dissent, for the following reasons derived both from the words of the biographer, and from the Satire itself.

I. The statement of the biographer is adverse to Mr Mac-

leane and Mr Pretor. Hunc ipsum librum means the present volume, as it does in another passage, editum *librum* continuo mirari homines et diripere ceperunt, and also in the well-known quotations, Multum et veræ gloriæ, quamvis uno libro, Persius meruit, *Quint.* x. 1, 94, and

Sæpius in libro memoratur Persius uno
Quam levis in tota Marsus Amazonide,

Mart. iv. 29, 7. It would then be forced, to make ultimo libro in the very next sentence signify the sixth Satire, as opposed to the completed whole. As to the words of the biographer, it is by no means certain that *correxit* is the true reading. MSS. P. 1, and 2, and M. 2, read *recitavit;* L. *contractarit;* and W. *contraxit.* If we suppose, with Jahn and Hermann, that *retractavit* was the true reading, *re...*ctavit for retractavit would give recitavit, and the variant *con*tractavit contraxit, and finally correxit. The words leviter retractavit would then mean that Cornutus gave a few finishing touches to the completed whole. And Jahn, præf. p. 45, shows that retractare was the term for final revision, even after publication. The *Latin* of the biographer, *versus dempti sunt ultimo libro,* taken by itself, is more in favour of Jahn and Mr Macleane than of Mr Pretor, for aliqui versus would more naturally mean a substantive fragment than detached lines, while it must be allowed that *quasi finiturus esset* at first sight favours Mr Macleane. But if we take *finiturus* absolutely, as in Ovid, *Art.* i. 755, *finiturus eram,* they will mean, "as if Persius intended to conclude with the sixth," *quasi,* as usual, denoting that, in reality, Persius did not conclude as we have him.

II. As to the Satire itself: the connexion is as follows:— You are enjoying your retreat, and so am I, 1—11. People have different ways of treating their income: there are misers in the world, but I am not one, 11—20. I, for my part, mean to enjoy my wealth, without being a prodigal, or a gourmand, 20—24. Take my advice *Live up, you, to your income, and don't spare it: another crop is on the way. Besides the consoling reflexion of my favourite,*

Cuncta manus avidas fugiunt heredis, amico
Quæ dederis animo—

Friendship has claims which we Stoics acknowledge, 25—30. But, cries an objector, if you (or I or anybody) do so, your heirs will give you a shabby funeral, and Bestius keeps growling at Greek notions of charity, because you don't save, like a true Roman, to keep up your house in the person of your heir. But these objections are answered by two considerations. First, you need not care about what happens when you are dead, and buried, *Hæc cinere ulterior metuas*, 41; and, second, the heir ought to take what he gets and be thankful, for he is not entitled to sixpence; and as for my own heir, if he gives me any impertinence, I'll waste a lot on this German triumph, or cut him off with an angry shilling by instituting a stranger, who after all is my own blood relation, for we both trace from mother Earth, 41—64. Don't, therefore, vex me, nor apply (*re*pone) to me the maxim a stingy father: *Spend the interest, my boy, but spare the principal.* Now, if you go on like that, confound the expense! I'll use more oil! I suppose *I* am to starve, that young Hopeful, whose cause you take up, may wax fat on my pinching and scraping, 64—74. And, after all, to enjoy wealth is the true wisdom, for if a man sells himself, body and soul, to speculation, no one can fix a sum, which will satisfy the speculator, any more than he can make infinity finite.

To justify this interpretation, we have only to take the second person in *emole, quid metuis, occa, frange, largire*, to convey Persius' own views in the form of precept. He then applies his own precept to himself, and hence *meus* heres, 41, and *mihi* trama figuræ, 73. But, if he, Persius, is for the nonce the first person, his opponent in the dialogue is the second, and so we have *tuus iste* nepos, *that fellow, whose case you are arguing, and who is* nepos *a rake;* as to *tuus iste* cf. Ter. *Ad. iste tuus*, I. 2. 59. In fact, a spokesman may speak in two ways: he may represent himself as one of the number he represents; or he may speak of his constituents only and suppress altogether his own personality. In the first case, he would say, "I" or "we"; in the second, "they" or "you"; so in v. 151—2, we find the same mixture of persons,

> Indulge genio, carpamus dulcia, nostrum est
> Quod vivis, cinis et manes et fabula fias.

So in Juv. x. 78 sq.

Ex quo suffragia nulli
Vendimus, effudit curas:

and

Exinde per amplum
Mittimur Elysium.....ut convexa revisant
Rursus et incipiant in corpora velle reverti.
Æn. VI. 743 sq.

and Eur. *Hipp.* 1328 sq.

Θεοῖσι δ' ὧδ' ἔχει νόμος·
οὐδεὶς ἁπαντᾶν βούλεται προθυμίᾳ
τῇ τοῦ θέλοντος ἀλλ' ἀφιστάμεσθ' ἀεί.

As to Vende animam lucro, the imperative[1] denotes hypothesis, as we may see by comparing Propertius, III. 25, 36,

Jam bibe: formosa es: nil tibi vina nocent,

with simul obligasti
Perfidum votis caput enitescis
Pulchrior multo.

In the former, we might, metre apart, say si bibis, and in the latter obliga perfidum caput, so that the passage in Persius is really equivalent to etiamsi vendas animam lucro, depungam ubi sistas, quum finitor infiniti inventus fuero. As to the *re* in repone, it seems to have its proper force: it is frequently used to signify, not repetition, but mere relation. Here a person volunteers advice, which seems to imply that a want exists on the part of the involuntary client. *Re*, thus would signify, *don't apply to my case the precept stored within your breast;* Repono is used in Prop. IV. 4. 37, with a similar sense of *re*,

Ille equus, ille meos in castra *re*ponet amores
Cui Tatius dextras collocat ipse jubas—

i. e. The horse of my lover will transfer from hence my love into his camp. So in Horace, classe cita *re*paravit oras, *i. e.* in

[1] When writing the above, I had not seen Mr Mayor's Note, *Juv.* I, 155, *pone* Tigellinum, *lucebis.* p. 161. Mr Mayor quotes several instances of the hypothetic imperative.

place of what she had. This force of *re* is very little attended to although it has been pointed out by Wagner: nempe *re*—in quibusdam verbis compositis significat rei alicujus in contrarium mutationem: *in contrarium*, however, seems too strong; change or sequence, as opposed to simple repetition, is what is here contended for: and in the passage in Persius, the contrast would be between the state of the precept in the breast of the adviser, and its successive state when applied to the case of the client. So in Virgil's sua nunc promissa reposci, the *re* denotes the relation between the promise given and the promise performed.

The Bestius of the piece is the representative of good old Roman notions: *keep up the House, and don't mind what these Stoic fellows tell us, that all men are brethren under the Law of Nature.* Parsimony was a Roman Virtue: Roman boys learnt at the same time their money-tables and the value of money: Hor. *A.P.* 325—330: the Roman Paterfamilias was expected to keep accounts with his own hand: and the regard of the Roman for the pecuniary honour of his House is shewn by the common practice of instituting a slave, as his heir, when his circumstances were embarrassed. Bestius, then, represents the Roman view, as opposed to the calls of charity, *officium*, the τὸ καθῆκον of the great ethical school to which Persius belonged.

THOMAS MAGUIRE.

ADDENDUM.

Mr Pretor, in a private letter, objects to laying stress on the juxtaposition of *librum* and *libro:*

"I cannot help thinking that (contrary to your argument) the juxtaposition of *librum...libro* rather makes it likely that they are used loosely—the first of the entire Satires, the latter of the last alone. I cannot think he would say 'this last book he left unfinished (*sc.* the entire Satires) from the last book (meaning the same) certain verses were withdrawn.'"

But, surely, the Biographer uses *Hunc ipsum librum* not, in

opposition to *ultimo libro*, but in illustration of his remark, *et raro et tarde scripsit.* I translate: *this very* volume *he left unfinished. Some verses were removed from* the end of the volume. *Libro* and *librum* thus denote the same thing—the present edition, as edited by Cornutus. Ultimus is thus used in Cic. Att. v. 16, 4 and in Ter. Heaut. v. 1, 29.

THEBAN INSCRIPTION AT THE FOUNTAIN OF DIRCE.

Towards the end of May 1864, I made a transcript of an inscription upon a stone which is built into the wall above the fountain of Dirce at Thebes. It was not till last summer that I looked into Bœckh's *Corp. Inscr. Gr.* in order to see how it was given. I had taken it for granted that an inscription in such a prominent position and so legible must certainly have been copied, and correctly, and that my own copying had been mere waste of time, except so far as it had given me some amusement.

The letters, though a good deal rubbed, were quite legible all through, with the exception of a very few: nowhere were there gaps of more than one or two letters together except in the first line, where the last two feet of the verse were missing, the stone being quite chipped away in that place. I identified the lines I had written out with No 1654 in Bœckh, but was astonished to find that the inscription as there given was hopelessly corrupt. I then went to look for my own copy, but could not find it, and have been unable to do so since. As I fear the sketch-book in which I had written down the lines is lost beyond the probability of recovery, I think I may fairly ask forgiveness if I give my version of the inscription from memory. My recollection of it is I believe quite clear except with respect to lines 5 and 6, in which I can only recall a couple of stray words.

The extreme inaccuracy of Pococke's transcript in the example before us may well make us suspicious of him in other cases. We have here a good instance of the way in which

patience and ingenuity may be thrown away by scholars in an attempt to emend passages which have been converted into absolute nonsense by the carelessness or ignorance of transcribers.

I will give the inscription and commentary as they appear in Bœckh, and then my own recollection of the thing. The omega in the original has the form of our W.

Bœckh, *Corp. Insc. Gr.*
1654.

Thebis. ed. Pocockius Insc. ant. P. I. c. 5. s. 3. p. 50.

ΟΠΟΣΩΚΑΡΤΗΣΓΟΡΤΙΠΙΟΣΙΟΙΙΟ....
ΠΛΙ...ΙΤΟΤΗΣΑΡΕΤΗΣΕΣΟΚΟΛΗΝΙΟΡΟΕ
ΟΜΝΗΣΗΙΣΕΝΕΤΙΚΚΕΝΗ
ΗΥΚΟΜΟΣΘΕΝΙΗΦΕΡΙΑΙΩ
ΕΥΝΟΗΣΙΠΩΗΓΡΑΤΙΚΑΣΤΕΙΜΗΙΟΙΣΤΕ ... ΙΙΟΙΣ
ΚΑΙΙΤΑΕΜΠΑΝΥΠΛΑΓΕΙΝ
ΑΛΛΑΕΝΟ...ΕΜΙΙΙΑΚΕΚ...ΟΙΡΑΔΟΒΕΙΑ
ΗΡΩΑΗΒΑΙΔΕΝΠΑΙΔΕΣΔΕΣΞΟΜΕΝΟΥ
ΤΟΥΤΟΥΤΟΥΡΙΔΙΗΛΛΟΙΟ..ΔΗΔΕΙΔΥΙ
ΕΣΤΗΣΕΥΠΡΑΕΙΣ . ΚΥΔΟΣΕΗΠΑΤΡΙΔΙ
ΘΥΓΑΤΡΙΣΚΑΤΑΓΑΙΑΝΟΣΑΙΣΔΙΟΕΙΕΩΓΕΝΟΣ
ΜΕΙΖΟΝΑΤΗΔΕΠΟΛΕΙΚΟΣΜΟΝΕΘΗΚΕΙ

.....Γόρ[γ]ιπ[π]ος.....
—...τῆς ἀρετῆς .....
:—..ἔτικ[τ]εν...?.....
ἠΰκομος....ίη φερ[τ]ά[τ]ῳ.....
εὐνο[ί]ῃσι?..... τειμη[τ]οῖς [σ]τε[φάν]οισ[ιν ?
καὶ τὰ.....
ἀλλὰ..... [Μ]οίρᾳ δ' [ὠ]κείᾳ?
ἥρωα...εν παιδ[ὸ]ς? [ἀ]εξομένου?
τούτου [κ]ουριδίη[ἄ]λο[χ]ο[ς]...[κέ]δ[ν'] εἰδυῖ[α
ἔστησ' Εὔπρα[ξ]ις? κῦδος ἑῇ πατρίδι.
[ο]ὐ γά[ρ τ]ις κατὰ γαῖαν ὅσαις Διό[θ]ε[ν] γένος [ἐστίν,
μείζονα τῇδε πόλει κόσμον ἔθηκε [γυνή.

Vs. 2. Sanderus conjecit *παντοίης ἀρετῆς ἐξοχο*...lacunam a Pocock. nimiam signari censens.

Vs. 9. ΔΗΔ mihi est ΔΝΑ (*κεδνα* p. *κέδν'*, ut solet in inscriptionibus): Sanderus conjecit [κ]ήδεϊ [λ]υ[γρῷ.]

Vs. 11, 12 idem emendavit. Ceteras horum distichorum partes non attingo. Εὔπραξις est nomen muliebre (n. 709, 1151).

ΟΥΤΟΣΣΩΚΑΡΤΗΣΓΟΡΤΥΝΙΟΣ.....
ΠΑΝΤΟΙΗΣΑΡΕΤΗΣΕΞΟΧΟΣΗΝΙΟΧΟΣ
ΟΝΜΗΤΗΡΜΕΝΕΤΙΚΤΕΝΕΝΙΚΡΗΤΗΕΥΡΕΙΗ
ΗΥΚΟΜΟΣΣΘΕΝΙΗΦΕΡΤΑΤΟΝΑΥΣΟΝΙΩΝ
* * * * * *
* * * * * *
ΑΛΛΑΕΝΟΥΣΟΣΕΜΑΡΨΕΚΑΚΗΚΑΙΜΟΙΡΑΒΑΡΕΙΑ
ΗΡΩΑΠΡΙΝΙΔΕΙΝΠΑΙΔΑΣΑΕΞΟΜΕΝΟΥΣ
ΤΟΥΤΟΥΚΟΥΡΙΔΙΗ ΑΛΟΧΟΣΚΕΔΝΕΡΓΕΙΔΥΙΑ
ΕΣΤΗΣΕΥΠΡΑΞΙΣΚΥΔΟΣΕΗΠΑΤΡΙΔΙ
ΟΥΓΑΡΤΙΣΚΑΤΑΓΑΙΑΝΟΣΑΙΣΔΙΟΘΕΝΓΕΝΟΣΕΣΤΙ
ΜΕΙΖΟΝΑΤΗΔΕΠΟΛΕΙΚΟΣΜΟΝΕΘΗΚΕΓΥΝΗ.

Οὗτος Σωκάρτης Γορτύνιος.....
παντοίης ἀρετῆς ἔξοχος ἠνίοχος.
ὃν μητὴρ μὲν ἔτικτεν ἐνὶ Κρήτῃ εὐρείῃ
ἠΰκομος, σθενίῃ φέρτατον Αὐσονίων.
κασιγνήτους τε [κρατα]ίους
καὶ [πάντων] ὑπάτων [κρέσσονας ἡγεμόνας.]
ἀλλά ἑ νοῦσος ἔμαρψε κακὴ καὶ Μοῖρα βαρεῖα
ἥρωα, πρὶν ἰδεῖν παῖδας ἀεξομένους.
τούτου κουριδίη ἄλοχος κέδν' ἔργ' εἰδυῖα
ἔστησ' Εὔπραξις κῦδος ἐῇ πατρίδι.
οὐ γάρ τις κατὰ γαῖαν ὅσαις Διόθεν γένος ἐστί
μείζονα τῇδε πόλει κόσμον ἔθηκε γυνή.

In line 5, ΚΑΣΤΕΙΜΗΙΟΙΣ ΤΕ is *κασιγνήτους τε*, and I think the following word is *κραταίους*.

In line 6 I can remember the word *ὑπάτων* which I take to be represented in Bœckh by ΥΠΛΑΓΕΙΝ, the first word is of course *καί*. I believe the line is *καὶ πάντων ὑπάτων κρέσσονας ἡγεμόνας*, but I cannot quite trust my memory in this particular case.

I cannot restore line 5, as Pococke's reading only helps to perplex me, and I have forgotten the clue which would enable me to correct it.

W. E. CURREY.

THE JOURNAL

OF

PHILOLOGY.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

In the last number of this Journal (III. p. 51 sq.) Mr Hort criticised and condemned a theory which I had suggested in the preceding number (II. p. 264 sq.) to account for certain facts connected with the text of the Epistle to the Romans. The *facts*, it will be remembered, were mainly these; (1) One or more ancient writers used a copy of the Epistle containing only the first fourteen chapters, with or without the doxology which in the common text stands at the close of the whole (xvi. 25—27). (2) In the existing copies this doxology appears sometimes at the end of the xivth chapter, sometimes at the end of the xvith, sometimes in both places, while in some few instances it is omitted altogether. (3) At least one text omits ἐν Ῥώμῃ in i. 7, 15. The *theory*, by which I sought to combine and explain these facts, was this; that St Paul at a later period of his life reissued the Epistle in a shorter form with a view to general circulation, omitting the last two chapters, obliterating the mention of Rome in the first chapter, and adding the doxology, which was no part of the original Epistle. Mr Hort impugns some of these assumed facts and explains away others. Having done this, he attacks the theory itself, and endeavours to show that it is untenable.

No one, who is really anxious to ascertain the truth, would object to such a criticism as Mr Hort's, even though it should

lead to the rejection of a darling theory. I am especially obliged to him for the thoroughness with which he has applied the test of textual criticism to my hypothesis. And, if I venture, notwithstanding his arguments, to maintain that the facts themselves are stubborn and in some respects even stronger than I had supposed, and to uphold my theory as the most probable explanation of the facts, until a better is suggested, I trust that I am not blinded by partiality. At all events I will give my reasons as briefly as possible, taking the facts first and then proceeding to the theory.

I. The first and most important of the facts is the existence, in early times, of copies containing only fourteen chapters. Of this the indications are various, and (as it seems to me) conclusive.

(i) The statement of Origen respecting Marcion has been 'universally understood,' as Mr Hort himself allows (p. 60), to mean that this heretic struck out not only the paragraph containing the doxology, but the two last chapters also; 'Caput hoc [*i.e.* the paragraph containing the doxology] Marcion, a quo Scripturæ evangelicæ atque apostolicæ interpolatæ sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit; et non solum hoc, sed et ab eo loco ubi scriptum est *Omne autem quod non ex fide peccatum est* (xiv. 23) ad finem cuncta dissecuit. In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est, in his quæ non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput diverse positum invenimus.' An universal understanding may be wrong, but most frequently it is correct; and I cannot doubt that this is the case here. Mr Hort however adopts a reading of a Paris MS (Reg. 1639) which has '*in* eo loco' for '*ab* eo loco,' and himself alters '*hoc*' into '*hic*.' Thus he makes Origen say that Marcion cut out the doxology, not only at the end of the xivth chapter, but also at the end of the Epistle. Now my reply to this is threefold; (1) Though we may allow the general value of the readings in this MS, whose date however is not earlier than about the 12th century, yet its text is far from faultless, so that only a slight presumption is raised in favour of a reading from the fact of its being found there. In the present instance however

the reading '*in* eo loco' has no meaning, unless with Mr Hort we likewise change *hoc* into *hic*—an alteration for which there is no MS authority. (2) Mr Hort's reading and interpretation destroy the force of individual expressions in the context. '*Usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit*' is natural enough when applied to two whole chapters, but not to the doxology alone; and again in 'hoc *ipsum* caput' the *ipsum* becomes meaningless, unless it is contrasted with some other portion. If the words be taken as they stand and interpreted in the ordinary way, the sequence commends itself; 'Caput *hoc*...non solum *hoc* sed...*usque ad finem cuncta*.. *hoc ipsum* caput'; but it is entirely broken up if they are read and explained as Mr Hort wishes. (3) One who reads continuously not only the passage quoted above, but the whole paragraph of Origen as given by Mr Hort (III. p. 59) or by myself (II. p. 265), will hardly fail, I think, to see how Mr Hort's interpretation involves and confuses the natural order of the topics.

When again Mr Hort supposes the statement of Jerome (on Ephes. iii. 5), that the doxology was found *in plerisque codicibus*, to have been derived from Origen's commentary on the same Epistle, I allow that this supposition is probable. But I do not see that Mr Hort's view gains strength thereby. Commenting on Ephes. iii. 5, Origen would be concerned only with the doxology in which 'the mystery' is mentioned, and he would be going out of his way, if he said anything about the omission of the xvth and xvith chapters, with which he was not in any way concerned. Moreover it must be observed that, when there is a question of a various reading, Jerome sometimes manipulates Origen's statements in such a manner as entirely to disfigure their meaning. Such is the case for instance with the opening verse of this very Epistle to the Ephesians, where Origen, having before him a text which omitted ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, interprets τοῖς οὖσιν in an entirely lucid though highly artificial way, but Jerome, repeating his great predecessor's comment, holds language which can hardly be called intelligible.

As regards the statement of Tertullian, when arguing against Marcion (v. 14), that the threat of the *tribunal Christi* (Rom. xiv. 10) occurs *in clausula* of the Epistle, I agree with

Mr Hort that the inference which supposes Tertullian to refer to a copy of the Epistle wanting the xvth and xvith chapters, though 'natural,' is not 'conclusive.' Let the fact that the inference is natural have no more than its proper weight. I should not have laid much stress on the expression, if it had stood alone; but in connexion with Origen's account of Marcion it cannot be overlooked.

(ii) For the negative argument that the last two chapters are nowhere quoted by certain early writers I claim a *supplemental* value. More than this it does not deserve. The fact however remains that neither Irenæus nor Tertullian nor Cyprian (except in a very doubtful allusion) refers to them. I will only add that this omission occurs in Western writers[1], whereas they are more than once quoted by Clement and Origen. The importance of this fact will appear hereafter.

(iii) I owe it to Mr Hort's candour that my attention was directed to the capitulations of the Latin Bibles, and the evidence derived thence seems to me to strengthen my case enormously. In my former article I had referred to Wetstein's note: 'Codex Latinus habet capitula Epistolæ ad Romanos 51, desinit autem in caput xiv; ex quo conficitur ista capitula ad editionem Marcionis fuisse accommodata'; and, misled with others by his careless expression *desinit* (where *desinunt* would have been clearer), I had naturally supposed that the MS itself, to which he refers, ended with the xivth chapter, and accordingly remarked that 'later critics had not been able to identify the MS and thus verify the statement.' I have no doubt however that Mr Hort is right, and that Wetstein refers to such a phenomenon as the Codex Amiatinus exhibits, where (though the Epistle itself is complete) the capitulations end with the end of the xivth chapter, there or thereabouts. I have since been investigating the subject[2]; and the results of this investigation

[1] The first distinct quotation by any Western writer, so far as I can discover, occurs in Victorinus *c. Arium* iii. p. 280 c, a treatise written about A. D. 365—where xvi. 20 is quoted. Even Hilary of Poitiers (if the index may be trusted) cites nothing from these two chapters but the doxology. The 'very doubtful reference' in Cyprian is given by Mr Hort, p. 65, note 2.

[2] After I saw Mr Hort's article in type, I began to look into the matter; and, before it was finally struck off, I mentioned the remarkable phenomenon

seem to be sufficiently important to justify my taking up a few pages in recording them.

In fact, there is evidence of two distinct capitulations—both ending with the xivth chapter—the first very widely spread, the second only preserved in a single though very early MS.

Of the *first* of these, the Codex Amiatinus affords the oldest and best example. In this MS the table of contents prefixed to the Epistle gives 51 sections, the 50th section being described 'De periculo contristante fratrem suum esca sua, et quod non sit regnum Dei esca et potus sed justitia et pax et gaudium in Spiritu Sancto,' and the 51st and last 'De mysterio domini ante passionem in silentio habito, post passionem vero ipsius revelato.' Corresponding to these, the sections are marked in the text, and agree with the descriptions in the table of contents as far as the 50th. The 50th is marked as beginning at xiv. 15, and here again the description is accurate; but the 51st commences with xv. 4, and has no connexion with the description. The description of the 51st in fact corresponds to the doxology (xvi. 25—27), and to nothing else in the remainder of the Epistle. The natural inference therefore is, that the capitulation was made for a copy of the Epistle, containing only fourteen chapters and the doxology; and that the scribe who first adapted it to a full copy with the sixteen chapters, not finding anything corresponding to the 51st section in the immediate context, extended the 50th section as far as the subject allowed him and made the 51st section include all the remainder of the Epistle. This solution, which Mr Hort allows to be certainly possible, seems to me to commend itself as in the highest degree probable.

This capitulation appears to have prevailed very widely. It is found in not less than seven MSS enumerated by Card. Tommasi (Thomasii *Op.* I. p. 388 sq. ed. Vezzosi), and dating from the age of Charles the Great downwards. It occurs again in the British Museum MS *Add.* 10,546, an Alcuinian copy, generally called 'Charlemagne's Bible,' but really written in one of the succeeding reigns; in the important MS *Harl.* 1772

of the capitulations in the Codex Fuldensis. To this conversation he refers in a note appended to his article (p. 80).

belonging to the 8th century; in the Oxford Bodleian MS *Laud. Lat.* 108 (E. 67) of the 9th century (in which however the number is expanded from 51 to 67 by a subdivision of one or more of the earlier sections); in the MS B. 5. 2 of Trin. Coll. Cambridge, belonging to the 11th or 12th century[1]; and in the Cambridge University MS Ee. 1. 9 written apparently late in the 13th century[2]. In *Add.* 10,546 the sections correspond in number and position with those of the Amiatinus, but the words are occasionally varied, e. g. *de non contristando fratre* for *de periculo contristante fratrem suum.* In *Harl.* 1772 the number of sections in the table of contents is reduced to 49 by combining §§ 43, 44, 45 in one section, while (except unimportant various readings) the words of the Amiatinus are strictly followed. In the text however the whole 51 sections are marked; of these the first 49 correspond to those of the Amiatinus, but the 50th commences not with the beginning of xiv. 15 *Si enim propter*, but with the middle *Noli cibo* (while on the margin in a later hand stands xlviiij opposite *Si enim propter*), and the 51st not with xv. 4 *Quœcumque enim*, but with the middle of xiv. 22 *Beatus qui* (the Q of *Quœcumque* being however illuminated). And again in Cambr. Univ. Ee. 1. 9, where the number of sections is similarly reduced to 50, the beginning of the 50th and last section 'de mysterio etc.' stands at xv. 1 *Debemus autem nos*, i. e. at the precise point where it would have stood, if the MS had contained only the doxology after the xivth chapter. These variations show the difficulty which was felt in adapting the end of the imperfect capitulation to the complete Epistle: and they answer any objection founded on the fact that in the Amiatinus itself the last section does not commence at the exact place in the text which the hypothesis seems to require.

In more than one MS however, which I have examined,

[1] In the older Trin. Coll. MS of St Paul's Epistles B. 10. 5, of the 9th century, the Epistle to the Romans and part of the First to the Corinthians are wanting. The Amiatinian capitulations are given for the other Epistles.

[2] In the Cambr. Univ. MS Ff. 4. 40, which came from the Library of Christ Church Canterbury and was written probably early in the 13th century, though the Amiatinian capitulations are not given, I find this note 'Hæc epistola capitula li dicitur habuisse.'

this capitulation is completed. The British Museum MS *Add.* 28,107 formerly belonged to the monastery of S. Remacle at Stavelot, and was written in the year 1097, 'ipso eodem anno quo versus hierusalem facta fuerat gentium plurimarum profectio,' as is stated at the end. The capitulation to the Epistle to the Romans gives 63 sections. Of these §§ 1—41 correspond with those of the *Amiatinus;* §§ 42, 43, 44, 45, are formed out of § 42 of the latter subdivided; and §§ 46—53 correspond to §§ 43—50 of the latter. Thus the heading of § 53 is 'Periculum contristantis fratrem suum esca sua etc.' There is nothing corresponding to § 51 of Amiatinus, which comprises the doxology, but § 54 (xiv. 19) is 'Quæ pacis sunt sectanda et fratres propter escam minime judicandi,' and § 55 (xv. 4) 'De doctrina et consolatione scripturarum et quod unanimiter sit honorificandus deus et pater domini nostri jesu christi'; while the last section of all (§ 63), beginning at xvi. 21, runs 'Salutatio timothei et cæterorum etiam et ipsius pauli qui epistolam in domino se scripsisse dicit.' The compiler was vigilant enough to see that the section 'de mysterio etc.' of the capitulation before him did not correspond to anything which followed, and therefore ejected it, and supplied (though not very intelligently) the remaining sections which were required to complete the Epistle.

Another complete capitulation, founded on the Amiatinian, occurs in the British Museum MS, *Reg.* 1. E. viii, which belonged to Christ Church, Canterbury, and may have been written about the middle of the tenth century. This capitulation, which is very brief and very slovenly, comprises 29 sections. The last of these are as follows:

xxiiii	de redditione unicuique omnium debitore (*sic*).
xxv	de periculo contristante fratrem esca sua.
xxvi	de mysterio domini ante passionem in silentio habitat (*sic*).
xxvii	post passionem domini ipsius mysterio revelatus.
xxviii	obsecratio pauli ad dominum ut liberetur ab infidelibus.
xxix	salutatio pauli ad fratres.

The retention and subdivision of the section comprising the doxology, where it has no meaning, is a curious phenomenon.

A third instance of completed capitulation is found in the

MS B. 5. 1 of Trin. Coll., Cambridge, belonging to the 12th century. Here the scribe has retained all the Amiatinian sections, including the doxology; but by combining two in the earlier part, he reduces them to 50 in number. Thus the 49th is 'de non contristando fratrem, etc.', and the 50th 'de mysterio domini, etc.' To these he adds two new sections, which are the same as those described in the last MS:

li obsecratio pauli ad dominum, etc.
lii salutatio pauli ad fratres.

In the text the 49th section begins at xiv. 50, the 50th at xv. 4, the 51st at xv. 30, and the 52nd at xvi. 1. The inequality of scale in these superadded sections shows that they did not proceed from the same hand as the rest[1].

These facts have been elicited by an examination of such MSS as came conveniently within my reach[2]. Doubtless a wider investigation would produce more striking results. But I have seen enough to convince me that the Amiatinian capitulation, though originally framed, as will be seen hereafter, for a short copy of the Old Latin, yet maintained its ground as a common mode of dividing the Epistle, until it was at length superseded by the present division into 16 chapters in the latter half of the 13th century.

The *second* capitulation, of which I spoke, is found in the Codex Fuldensis which, like the Amiatinus, was written about the middle of the 6th century. The sections in the text correspond exactly with the Amiatinian. Not so in the table of contents. Of the latter Ranke remarks (*Codex Fuldensis*, p. xxiii, 1868): 'Quæ epistolæ ad Romanos præmissa sunt capitula duabus in partibus constant, quarum altera (i—xxiii), *totius*

[1] The relation between the two MSS last described is curious. For, while other indications would suggest that the capitulations of Brit. Mus. *Reg.* 1. E. viii. were derived from those of Trin. B. 5. 1, the former presents the older form of the Amiatinian 50th section 'de periculo contristante fratrem,' while the latter substitutes the amended form 'de non contristando fratrem,' which perhaps appears first in the Alcuinian copies.

[2] My examination has not extended beyond the British Museum MSS to the 11th century (inclusive), and the MSS in the Cambridge University and Trinity College Libraries. The information respecting Bodl. *Laud. Lat.* 108 I owe to Mr Coxe, the Librarian.

fere epistolæ argumentum in se continens, per se ipsa stare videtur, altera (xxiii—li) iis respondet quæ iisdem sub numeris in cod. Amiatino proferuntur.' The words which I have italicised are not very exact. These 23 sections, which belong to a different capitulation from the remainder, reach to about the end of the fourteenth chapter, the last (§ xxiii) being 'Quod fideles dei non debeant invicem judicare cum unusquisq. secundum regulas mandatorum ipsa se debeat divino judicio præparare ut ante tribunal dei sine confusione possit operum suorum præstare rationem.' The 24th Amiatinian section, which follows next, begins with ix. 1, so that six chapters (ix—xiv) are included twice. The natural inference is that the scribe, remembering that the text contained 51 sections and seeing that the table of contents gave less than half that number, applied himself to another source, and completed the headings of the remaining sections from the Amiatinian capitulation. Whether the capitulation from which §§ i—xxiii are taken contained the doxology or not, must remain doubtful. The analogy of the Amiatinian sections would suggest that it did. The 23 summaries peculiar to the Fuldensis are very broad and general; thus § xxii 'de mundanis potestatibus honorandis quia oportet oboediri his quib. ad mundanum regumen dominus tribuit potestate,' though including the whole of our 13th chapter, omits to take account of the last half, vv. 8—14; and in like manner in § xxiii the doxology may not have been thought worthy of any special attention in this heading[1].

Mr Hort indeed impugns the value of this Fuldensian capitulation on the ground that the headings 'are loaded with Augustinian or Anti-Pelagian phraseology, and cannot therefore be dated much before 400 at earliest' (p. 80, note). I have no

[1] Besides the capitulations mentioned in the text, I have noticed one other which is unconnected with either. It contains 18 sections and includes the whole epistle. This capitulation is found in:

(1) Brit. Mus. *Add.* 11,852, a MS which belonged to the monastery of St Gall, and was written in the 9th century.

(2) Brit. Mus. *Add.* 24,142 'Monasterii S. Huberti in Ardvenna,' supposed to have been written about A.D. 900.

In this last MS though the table of contents gives 18 chapters, the Epistle itself is divided by marginal numbers into smaller sections, 125 in number.

wish to deny that there is force in this argument; which nevertheless does not seem to me conclusive. The strongest expressions in this direction are 'pro fide romanorum ... deo apostolus gratias agit *ut probetur fidem in deum muneris est divini*,' and 'in Christo Jesu qui solus sic humana [humanam] naturam recepit ut eum *contagia veteris originis* non tenerent.' The African fathers were more or less Augustinian before Augustine's time, and (so far as I can see) might have held such language[1].

On any showing however the Latin Bibles bear strong testimony to the existence of the shorter forms of this Epistle at an early date. The alternative hypothesis, that these sections were determined by the lessons read in Churches, is devoid alike of evidence and of probability. With this single exception, the Amiatinian capitulation in the New Testament includes, I believe, the entire book in every case. It does not bear the slightest trace of being intended for lectionary purposes. Nor indeed is there any reason why the 15th chapter should be excluded from the lessons; for it is much more fit for public reading than many sections elsewhere, which are retained. Even the 16th chapter would be treated with exceptional rigour on this showing, for in other epistles the paragraphs containing the salutations are religiously recorded in the capitulation. Moreover, the oldest evidence which we possess on the subject exhibits lessons for Sundays and Festivals taken from the 15th chapter; and if so, *a fortiori* it would not be neglected in the daily lessons, supposing (which seems improbable) that daily lessons had been instituted at the time when this capitulation was made.

When my attention was first directed to the Amiatinian capitulation, I naturally inferred that it had belonged originally to the Old Latin and was later adapted to the Vulgate. A further examination has shown this inference to be correct. The

[1] e. g. Cyprian *Ep.* 64, says 'Secundum Adam carnaliter natus, *contagium mortis antiquæ* prima nativitate contraxit.' Compare also Tertull. *de Anim.* 40, 41; and see Neander *Hist. of Christian Dogmas*, I. p. 185 sq. (Eng. Trans.). Augustine's own dogmatic views on these points were enunciated before Pelagius took up the subject: ib. p. 347 sq.

capitulation preserves at least one crucial reading of the Old Latin. In § xlii the words 'de tempore serviendo' show that its author for τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες read τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες in xii. 11, a reading which Jerome especially quotes as condemning the Old Latin and justifying his own revision (*Epist.* 28, *Op.* I. 133, ed. Vallarsi).

Thus, taking into account all the evidence, the statement of Origen respecting Marcion (confirmed by the incidental expression of Tertullian), the absence of quotations in several early fathers, and the capitulation (or capitulations) of the Latin Bibles, we have testimony various, cumulative, and (as it seems to me) irresistible, to the existence of shorter copies of the Epistle containing only fourteen chapters with or without the doxology in early times. Even though it be granted that Mr Hort has given a possible explanation (I cannot allow that his explanations are probable) of each of these facts singly on a different hypothesis, still the convergence of so many independent testimonies direct or indirect towards this one point must be regarded, if I mistake not, as conclusive.

II. However the evidence does not end here. The fact that in existing MSS the doxology occurs in different places (see p. 193) is very intimately connected with the fact or class of facts considered under the first head. And here again I cannot help remarking that my position has this great advantage over Mr Hort's, that whereas I postulate only one unknown fact to explain all or most of the phenomena, he is obliged to postulate a distinct one to account for each several phenomenon in turn.

As regards the varying position of this doxology, Mr Hort's explanation supposes the following stages. (1) The original place was at the end of the Epistle. (2) It was afterwards attached to xiv. 23 for reading in Church. (3) 'Scribes accustomed to hear it in that connection in the public lessons would half mechanically introduce it into the text of St Paul' at this place. (4) It would then be struck off from the end of the Epistle, that the same doxology might not occur twice. Thus we arrive at the vulgar Greek text, which has it at the end of the xiv th chapter only.

Now, waiving for the present the consideration of its original position, I wish to point out two great improbabilities involved in the other assumptions in this sequence. *First.* There is no such obvious connexion between the paragraph at the end of chapter xiv and the doxology, as should lead to their being connected together[1], if separated in their original position by two whole chapters, while on the other hand these intervening chapters present material for more than one excellent lesson. Bengel indeed suggests, as Mr Hort points out, that the *severa sententia ἁμαρτία ἐστίν*, with which chapter xiv closes, would be deemed unfit for the end of a lesson and that this inauspicious termination was got rid of by tacking on the doxology. But how much more easily would the difficulty have been overcome by continuing the lesson a little further and closing with the 2nd or 4th or 6th verse of the next chapter. The instance which Mr Hort quotes (p. 72, note 1), Acts vi. 8—vii. 2 combined with vii. 51—viii. 4, as a lesson for St Stephen's day, will hardly bear out his hypothesis, for there the combination is naturally suggested by the subject. *Secondly.* This solution requires us to believe that all the three steps numbered (2), (3), (4), had taken place before Origen's time, so that he can speak of some MSS as having the doxology in the one place and some in the other, without suspecting how the variation had come to pass. This supposes such an early development of the lectionary as (I believe) there is no ground for assuming.

III. Lastly there are the phenomena in the first chapter to be considered. Here the important fact is, that in one extant MS (G) certainly, and in another (F) probably, the mention of Rome has been obliterated in *two distinct* passages. In i. 7 Mr Hort explains the omission by the fact that 'a Western correction substitutes *ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ* for *ἀγαπητοῖς Θεοῦ*,' so that the words would run ΕΝΡΩΜΗΕΝΑΓΑΠΗ, where the repetition of *ἐν*

[1] In a note (p. 71) Mr Hort remarks that 'the Synaxaria, *valeant quantum*, give Rom. xiv. 19—23, *plus* the doxology as the lesson' for the Saturday before Quinquagesima. But since the doxology occurs here in the vulgar Greek text which prevailed at Antioch and Constantinople and from which the Synaxaria are taken, they would naturally read it here. I would add that the Synaxaria (see Scrivener's *Introduction*, p. 68 sq.) present no parallel to the omission of two whole chapters.

might occasion the omission of one of the two clauses, especially as the archetype of this MS appears to have been written stichometrically and each ἐν might commence a new line. Thus the omission would be *accidental.* But apparently dissatisfied with this solution he offers a second suggestion, that the omission was *intentional*; for he adds, 'These two MSS (F and G) have further a trick of omitting words that do not appear necessary to the sense,' and gives instances. The accidental omission I could understand, but the intentional (thus explained) seems hardly credible, for the words ἐν Ῥώμῃ are essential to an Epistle to the Romans. Of the omission in i. 15 he gives no direct explanation, except so far as it may be involved in the words 'we may be content to suspect that in these two verses like causes produced like results' (p. 76). I do not understand this, unless by like causes is meant the desire in both cases to *obliterate a superfluous clause.* I too maintain that 'like causes produced like results,' but I cannot allow that the historical fact involved in the mention of Rome could be regarded as a superfluity in an Epistle to the Romans; and, if the omission was intentional in both cases, it must have been (so far as I can see) from the desire of obliterating the proper name, because the proper name was no longer applicable. The hypothesis, that a coincidence so remarkable as the omission of the same name in two distinct passages could have been purely accidental, seems to me to be the most improbable of all.

That the twin MSS F, G, did not stand alone in this omission, appears from the marginal note in 47, on which Mr Hort has some remarks, p. 73. Whether to these authorities we should add the commentaries of Origen and the Ambrosian Hilary, must remain uncertain. I certainly should not have discovered the omission in them, if it had not occurred independently, and I am not prepared to say that Mr Hort's explanation (p. 74) of their language is not right. At the same time to my own mind the 'Benedictio quam dat *dilectis Dei* ad quos scribit' of Origen, and the '*Quamvis* Romanis scribat, illis tamen scribere se significat *qui in caritate Dei sunt*' of Hilary, still leave the same impression; but probably they will strike others differently.

It will thus be seen that Mr Hort denies some of my facts, and impugns the significance of others. As the facts give him no trouble, it follows that the hypothesis, which has no other *raison d'être* but to explain them, should not find favour with him. But, if (as I think I have shown) the facts are even more cogent than they appeared at first, being reinforced by the Latin capitulations, an explanation is still demanded. I cannot indeed say that my hypothesis is free from objections. But *a priori* improbabilities could be detected by the keen eye of criticism in the most certain events of history; and a theory, which is based on circumstantial evidence, cannot hope to escape objection on this ground. But, if no other hypothesis has been offered which does not involve more or greater improbabilities, and if some hypothesis is needed to account for the facts, I must still venture to claim a hearing for my own.

In Mr Hort's criticism of the theory itself, as distinct from the facts which evoked it, there are three points especially which call for a reply.

(i) I had assigned the doxology (xvi. 25—27) to the shorter recension of the Epistle, which I supposed to have been issued by St Paul himself at a later date, and had produced parallels to show that its style very closely resembles that of the Apostle's later Epistles. Mr Hort himself considers it to have been the termination of the original Epistle. His argument is threefold: (*a*) that it is appropriate; (*b*) that St Paul at the time entertained the ideas contained in it; (*c*) that it presents numberless close parallels of expression to the earlier Epistles.

(*a*) As regards its appropriateness, I entirely agree with him. I cannot indeed assent to Baur's opinion which he adopts, that the main drift of the Epistle is revealed in chapters ix—xi. The central idea, as I conceive it, is the *comprehensive offer of righteousness* to Jews and Gentiles impartially, following on the *comprehensive failure* of both alike before Christ's coming. After this idea has been developed, the objection arises that, however comprehensive may be the *offer*, the *acceptance* at all events is partial and one-sided; that while the Gentiles seem gladly to accept it, the Jews stand aloof; and that thus the promises of the Old Testament appear to be nullified, and indeed

reversed. It is to meet the objection which thus starts up, that St Paul pierces the veil of the future and discerns the gathering of the Jews into the same fold whither the Gentiles have preceded them. Thus the *result* will be comprehensive, as the *offer* has been comprehensive. But however fit a consummation of the Apostle's teaching this prophetic announcement may be, it does not in itself contain the nucleus of that teaching.

To the whole body of the Epistle however, in which the comprehensive failure, the comprehensive grace, the comprehensive acceptance, have been set forth in succession, the doxology forms an eminently appropriate close. An outburst of thanksgiving for the revelation of this 'mystery' of the impartial Fatherhood of God in Christ is the proper sequel to the contents of the Epistle. This adaptation would not indeed be easily reconcileable with any other authorship than St Paul's; but if written by him, whether written early or late, we should expect it to be appropriate.

(*b*) And again I grant that its main idea—the impartiality and universality of God's grace as a truth revealed in Christ—was not foreign to St Paul's thoughts at this time, though it assumed a much greater prominence afterwards. Indeed it may be said that this idea necessarily flowed from his commission as the Apostle of the Gentiles.

(*c*) But, as regards the expression of the idea, I join issue with him. The general style seems to me to be cast essentially in the mould of the later Epistles. The diffusive syntax of the paragraph is exactly what we find, for instance, in the Epistle to the Ephesians. And, when we come to individual phrases, there is (if I mistake not) a very wide difference in point of closeness between Mr Hort's parallels with the earlier Epistles and mine with the later. Compare for example his parallel of Rom. xiv. 4 with mine of Eph. iii. 20 for *τῷ δυναμένῳ*, or of Rom. iii. 29, 30 with mine of 1 Tim. i. 17 for *μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ*. The only exceptions in favour of the earlier Epistles occur exactly where on my hypothesis we should expect to find them. The expression *ὑπακοὴ πίστεως* is repeated in this final doxology from the opening paragraph of the Epistle (i. 5), and the reference to the prophetic Scriptures also has a parallel

in the same paragraph (i. 2). On my hypothesis the opening portion was read over and altered, when some years later the Epistle was issued by the Apostle in this second and shorter form; and it was therefore natural that the thanksgiving which was then appended, should embody not only thoughts but also expressions taken from the commencement, thus binding together the beginning and the end of the Epistle.

(ii) The character and condition of the text of the twin MSS, F and G, is one of the points on which Mr Hort lays most stress; and certainly, if his account of my theory were correct, I should find it difficult to answer him. Expressing my hypothesis in his own words, he represents me as holding (1) that 'the scribe of G copied i—xiv from one MS and xv, xvi, from another,' and (2) that 'the scribe of F copied in like manner from the same *two MSS*, though he left no mark of the transition from the one to the other' (p. 68). He then remarks that 'If the first of these hypotheses were true we ought surely to find some evidence of it in the respective texts; whereas the closest study fails to detect a shadow of difference in the character of the readings before and after the blank space'; and that 'when F is taken into account, fresh embarrassments arise.' But I did not for a moment contemplate the scribes of F and G each of them copying *directly* from these two MSS, containing respectively the shorter and the longer recension of the Epistle. I was well aware that the phenomena of these MSS would not admit of such a supposition. And I venture also to think that my language, which Mr Hort himself quotes just before (p. 67), cannot be taken in this sense: 'The copyist of an *earlier* MS, from which it [G] *has descended*, transcribed a MS of the abridged recension till the end of chapter xiv, and then took up a MS of the original Epistle to the Romans'; 'Either their common *prototype* [i. e. of F and G] or *a still earlier* MS from which it was copied, must have preserved the abridged recension.' This language was expressly intended by me to leave open the question, as to the length of the pedigree which connected F and G with the scribe who first combined the two recensions; and the idea of *direct parentage*, which Mr Hort has imposed upon me, never once entered my

mind. Thus I left ample room for the development of the peculiarities of F and G. Only I assumed that the retention of the vacant space at the end of chapter xiv, which I took to indicate the end of the Epistle in one of the two original MSS, had survived this development. But though I still think that (taking it in connexion with all the other textual phenomena on which I dwelt) my account of this blank space is the most probable, yet this is only a subsidiary support to my view, and I could abandon it without any material injury to the main hypothesis.

But let us enquire what Mr Hort's statement, that 'the closest study fails to detect a shadow of difference in the character of the readings before and after the blank,' really amounts to, when considered in its bearing on my hypothesis.

The characteristics of F and G, which differentiate them from what we may call the standard text of St Paul's Epistles, as based on the coincidence of the best authorities, are twofold: (1) Those which they exhibit in common with the Western authorities, and more especially that type of Western authorities which appears in the Old Latin Version; and (2) Those which are peculiar to these two MSS.

To the *first* class, comprising those readings which must be referred to the Western type, belong the most important, as well as the most numerous, variations from the standard text, whether in the first fourteen or in the last two chapters of the Epistle. If the two MSS (containing respectively the long and the short form), from which on my hypothesis the text of FG was *ultimately* derived, were both of them Western, as on all accounts we might probably conclude that they were, then we should expect to find these readings pervading the xvth and xvith chapters, as well as the earlier part of the Epistle. It is difficult to explain the origin and prevalence of the Western type of text at all; but this difficulty was not introduced by my hypothesis, nor do I see that it is increased thereby.

Speaking of the peculiar features of F and G, Mr Hort says, 'The partial adherence of D excepted, this character is unique among existing Greek MSS.' On this statement I should wish to make two remarks. (1) The expression *partial* seems to me

inadequately to express the degree of coincidence between D on the one hand, and FG on the other. Certainly in the two last chapters of this Epistle, with which we are mainly concerned, by far the greater number of the important deviations from the standard text are shared by D in common with FG. (2) These three are the *only*[1] *three Greek uncial MSS* which, whether on external or internal grounds, can be assigned to the Western family. Whatever distinctive features therefore they possess in common, it is reasonable to set down to the Western type of MSS generally. The Old Latin Version (with the exception of a few fragments) is only known to us through these same MSS, which are bilingual; for other independent copies, which contain a more or less pure Old Latin text, have not been collated: and its phenomena entirely accord with this supposition. The remaining source of evidence—the *early* patristic quotations—does not offer any obstacle to this conclusion; and indeed in the last two chapters of the Epistle, this evidence, as has been mentioned, is entirely wanting. On the whole then, I think it may be said that the coincidence of D with F and G represents very fairly the Western text.

The *second* class of readings, those peculiar to F and G, are in the xvth and xvith chapters comparatively unimportant. The divergences of these twin MSS from D may be taken as *approximately* representing their peculiarities, though in the course of the analysis it will be seen that in many cases these divergences are supported by other, and especially by Western, authorities[2].

These are as follows:

xv. 1 αρεσκον [αρεσκειν]; 3 ουκ [ουχ]; 7 ὑμας [D* ἡμας, but D** ὑμας with most authorities, including Western]; 11 επαινεσατε [D επαινεσα-

[1] I pass over E, which is now acknowledged (at least so far as regards the Greek) to be a direct copy of D, and therefore to have no independent value.

[2] I have not recorded either the accidental errors of G when these have been corrected at the time when the MS was written, or the divergences of F from G. Mr Hort's view, that F was copied directly from G, deserves consideration, and may prove true, though his arguments do not seem quite conclusive. So far as it has any bearing on my hypothesis, it is rather favourable than otherwise. The converse proposition, that G is copied from F, could not be maintained for a moment.

τωσαν, but the Latin of D has *Magnificate* with many other authorities, and the variation is easily explained in a quotation from the LXX]; 13 πληροφορησαι...πασῃ χαρα και ειρηνῃ [D πληρωσαι.. πασης χαρας και ειρηνης, but B agrees with FG, inserting however εν before πασῃ. The Old Latin has *repleat...omni gaudio et pace*]. 16 Ιησου Χριστου [D Χριστου Ιησου, but the Latin of D has *Jesu Christi* which also has the vast preponderance of authority in its favour]. 18 ὁ Χριστος [om. ὁ]. 21 αναγγελῃ [ανηγγελη]. 24 ελπιζω [D adds γαρ with the preponderance of authorities, but the Latin of D omits it, and so do the Latin fathers]. 25 νυν [νυνι]. 26 Μακαιδονες [Μακεδονες]. 27 οφειλεται γαρ [om. γαρ, but the Latin of D and Ambrosiaster have it]; αυτων εισιν [εισιν αυτων]. 28 ουν αρα [om. αρα. The Latin of G is *Hoc ergo igitur ergo*]. ὑμας [ὑμων]. 29 γινωσκω γαρ [D οιδα δε, but the Latin of D has *scio enim*, and other authorities, especially Latin Fathers, have the same conjunction]. 30 προσευχαις [add ὑπερ εμου, but several Latin authorities, including the Latin of D, omit the words]. 31 προσδεκτος [ευπροσδεκτος. The Latin of D is *acceptalis* (sic)]. 32 αναψυχω [αναψυξω]. 33 υμων [add. αμην, but A and others omit it].

xvi. 1 ὑμων [ἡμων, but the Latin of D has *vestram*, and AP also have ὑμων]. 2 παραστατεις [προστατις]. 3 ασπασθαι [ασπασασθε. This blunder recurs]. 8 Αμπλιατον [Αμπλιαν, but the longer form occurs in the Latin of D]. 10 Αριστοβολου [Αριστοβουλου, but the Latin of D has *Aristoboli* and this form is found in B and elsewhere]. 11 συγγενη [D συγγενην, but corrected by a later hand]. 4 ασπασασθε...εν κυριω om. with A. 15 Ιουνιαν [D Ιουλιαν, which is correct, but C* has Ιουνιαν]. Ολυμπειδα [D Ολυμπιαν, but Latin authorities, including the Latin of D itself, have *Olympiada* or *Olympiadem*]. 17 παρακαλω [D* ερωτω, but corrected. The rest have παρακαλω]. παρα [D* περι, but corrected]. 18 κυριω [τω κυριω]. δουλευσουσιν [δουλευουσιν]. 23 ὁλαι αἱ εκκλησιαι [ὁλης της εκκλησιας. The Latin of DFG alike is *universæ ecclesiæ*, which would cover both readings. Another reading is ὁλη ἡ εκκλησια. The Æth. is said to have ὁλαι αἱ εκκλησιαι with FG]. 24 om. Ιησου Χριστου.

This analysis of the readings in the last two chapters shows two things; (1) That in almost every point even of minor importance, in which the text of FG diverges from the correct standard, it agrees with the Western text as exhibited by D or by some other authority; and (2) that the exceptions, which thus form the peculiarities of FG, are in almost every instance trivial and are easily explained by carelessness or caprice in copying. Hence it follows; *first*, that the scribe, who (on my hypothesis) wrote the archetype of F and G, taking up an average copy of the Western text to supply the xvth and xvith

chapters, would find a text substantially such as we actually have here; and *secondly*, that no long pedigree need have been interposed between this archetype and FG, in order to develope the phenomena which they exhibit in these chapters; but that the intervention of a single scribe, or two at most, would explain everything. If so, the argument from the character of the text cannot be considered a substantial objection to my view.

(iii) Mr Hort advances another argument against my hypothesis based on the assumption that the textual phenomena on which my theory is built are gathered together from *incongruous* sources; and he even goes so far as to ask, 'How is it that every authority, which supports, or may be thought to support, some part of this combination [i.e. the Short Recension, involving (*a*) the omission of the word Rome in the first chapter, (*b*) the omission of the xvth and xvith chapters, (*c*) the presence of the doxology] contradicts some other part?' (p. 76)

To this statement I demur. I allow indeed that all these phenomena do not coexist in any extant authority. If this had been the case, I should not have had to frame a hypothesis, for the existence of this Shorter Recension would have been an absolute fact. But that there is any contradiction in my authorities, which prejudices the hypothesis, I cannot allow.

This attack has led me to marshal my troops to better effect. I wish especially to call attention to the fact, that the authorities, on which I chiefly rely, have for the most part a close affinity to one another and that they belong to the Western type. The Latin capitulations derived, as I have shown, from the Old Version are essentially such. The copy or copies, to which they refer, presented two (*b*, *c*) out of the three phenomena, and (for anything we know) may have presented the third (*a*) also. The remarkable absence of quotations from the last two chapters in the earlier Latin Fathers points in the same direction. The MSS FG, which are the only indisputable vouchers for (*a*), are essentially Western. Their relation to (*b*), (*c*), is a matter of dispute between Mr Hort and myself; but the fact that there is a great break in G at the end of the xivth chapter (however explained) cannot but be held to favour my hypothesis to a greater or less

degree. The exception to the Western origin of the evidence is Marcion, who, being an Eastern, used a copy of this Epistle in which the two last chapters including the doxology were wanting. But even Marcion is known to have resided for many years in Rome; and if during his sojourn in the West, he fell in with a copy of the Short Recension, he might have welcomed it gladly, as sparing him the superfluous use of his scissors, which would be required to eliminate such passages as xv. 8, 27.

Hitherto there is no incongruity in the sources from which my data are taken. But the position of the doxology in the several authorities still remains to be considered; and it is evidently here that Mr Hort considers the main 'contradiction' to lie. Though 'there is no lack of authorities of a sort for subjoining the doxology to xiv,' he writes, yet 'they have no sort of genealogical affinity with the MS that ignores Rome or with Marcion.' Now to this I would reply that the capitulations of the Latin Bibles certainly have this affinity, and that (for all we know) the MSS mentioned by Origen as placing the doxology in this position may have had it also. On the other hand his statement, so far as regards the extant MSS and the patristic authorities generally, which exhibit it at the end of the xivth chapter, is indisputably true. They belong to the great Antiochene or Constantinopolitan family, which though by far the most numerous, is of inferior authority. On the contrary the place of the doxology in the extant Western authorities is at the end of the xvith chapter. But, allowing the fact, I cannot accept the inference. For suppose that a scribe had before him copies of the two recensions (according to my hypothesis), the one comprising the 14 chapters together with the doxology, the other including all the 16 chapters but omitting the doxology and ending with xvi. 23 Κούαρτος ὁ ἀδελφός. If he set himself to combine the two so as to omit nothing, is it not at least as likely that, when he arrived at the end of the xivth chapter, he would reserve the doxology for the end of the whole Epistle where it seemed to be required to finish off an abrupt conclusion, as that he would leave it at the end of the xivth chapter? The same motive which led others

to transpose the benediction (ἡ χάρις κ.τ.λ.), which properly stands at xvi. 20, to xvi. 24, might even more easily induce him to treat the doxology in a similar way, inasmuch as he would still leave it the *end* of the Epistle as he found it, though the Epistle had been lengthened out by the two additional chapters. Thus the fact that the Western authorities place the doxology after ch. xvi, seems to me to prove nothing as to the want of *affinity* between the several authorities for my hypothesis.

But this investigation leads me to observe (and I think the observation is pertinent) how entirely this Western character of the authorities coincides with my hypothesis. I suggested that 'at some later period of his life, not improbably during one of his sojourns in Rome, it occurred to the Apostle to give this letter a wider circulation'; and that for this purpose he made the alterations which resulted in the shorter edition, so that it was rendered 'available for general circulation and perhaps was circulated to prepare the way for a personal visit in countries into which he had not yet penetrated' (p. 294). This hypothetical change is made in the West and for the West; and it cannot be considered a matter of indifference that to this same region we owe the authorities which suggested the hypothesis, though at the time when I propounded it I did not see the full significance of this fact.

With these remarks I will leave the theory. For a reply so thorough and so suggestive as Mr Hort's I can only feel grateful. It has led me to consolidate the different elements of my hypothesis, and, unless I am mistaken, to present a stronger front to attack. From criticisms of inferior merit I might have found less to dissent, but I certainly should have found less to learn.

J. B. LIGHTFOOT.

THOUGHT, WORD, AND DEED.

Professor Weber in his very interesting article on the Jaina treatise, the Bhagavatí (published in the Abhandlungen der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1866), has the following note (p. 173), on the so-called Yoguvaoga, or 'addiction or attachment of the mind, speech, and body to any act:'

"Diese alt-ârische, auch im Veda bereits mehrfach sich findende Dreitheilung hat, wohl von Persien aus (durch den Avesta, resp. speciell etwa durch die Manichäer), auch in die christliche Liturgie Eingang gefunden, findet sich resp. in der angeblich auf Papst Damasus (Mitte des 4 Jahr.) zurückgehenden Confessions-Formel der gregorianischen Messe, 'quia peccavi nimis cogitatione verbo et opere' (s. Daniel, Codex Liturgicus, pp. 50—51, 115. Nitzsch, Praktische Theologie, 2, 281), und von da aus dann schliesslich in dem 'mit Herzen, Mund, und Händen' unsres neuern Kirchenliedes wieder."

Prof. Koeppen, in his Religion des Buddha, I. p. 445, had previously claimed this ethical division as a Buddhist discovery; at least he adds, "findet sich übrigens auch bei den Parsen und Manichaern, wie bie den Brahmanen, bei den letzteren jedoch so vereinzelt, dass man wohl voraussetzen darf, dieselbe sey nicht urspringlich brahmanisch."

But there can be no doubt that it is older in Indian literature than the rise of Buddhism, as we find it in the Sanhitá of the Black Yajur Veda, VI. 1. 7, where we have the following mystical explanation of certain words addressed to the cow which is given as the price of the soma plant, and which is supposed to represent the goddess Speech: "He addresses her, 'thou art thought,' for what he thinks by his mind (*manasá*), that he says by speech (*váchá*); he addresses her, 'thou art

mind,' for what he grasps by mind, that he does;" and similarly in the Aitareya Bráhmaṇa, II. 28, we find the Maitrávaruṇa priest compared to the mind and the Hotṛi to the voice, because the former orders the latter to repeat the necessary formulæ, and "speech speaks only if impelled by the mind;" while the Adhwaryu, who performs the manual labour of the sacrifice, seems to be tacitly compared to the external action.

This however is a mental rather than a moral division, and corresponds to Plato's similar analysis in the Protagoras (p. 348), where he says *εὐπορώτεροι γάρ πως ἅπαντές ἐσμεν οἱ ἄνθρωποι πρὸς ἅπαν ἔργον καὶ λόγον καὶ διανόημα.* But the chief interest of the division lies in its ethical bearing, as it supplies a ready popular formula for tracing the history of a virtuous or vicious action; and it is this practical utility which has secured it such a wide recognition in Europe and Asia.

Now we distinctly find this ethical application of the phrase in the Áraṇyaka of the Black Yajur Veda, X. 1. 10. "*Yan me manasá vachá karmaṇá dushkṛitam kṛitam,*" "whatever sin has been committed by me in mind, voice and action;" and in II. 3 we have an earlier form, "may the household fire deliver us from all the sins that we have committed by voice, by mind, by arms, thighs, or knees, "*yad váchá yan manasá báhubhyám úrubhyám ashṭivadbhyám śiśnair yad anṛitam chakṛimá vayam, agnir má tasmád enasaḥ gárhapatyaḥ pramunchatu.*"

But though this Áraṇyaka is probably older than Buddhism, it is highly probable that the frequent use of the phrase in this moral sense in classical Sanskrit literature, as compared with its very rare use in Vedic literature, may be really due to the influence of Buddhism on the Brahmanical mind. It certainly seems to occur very often in Buddhist works: thus it is said in the Dhammapadam, v. 96,

> *Santam tassa mano hoti, santá váchá cha kamma cha*
> *Sammadañ ñávimuttassa, upasantassa tádino.*

Thus translated by Professor Max Müller in his introduction to Buddhaghosha's Parables: "His thought is quiet, quiet are his word and deed, when he has obtained freedom by true knowledge,

when he has thus become a quiet man." (Cf. also his note *ad l.*). This division is in fact a fundamental tenet of Buddhist ethics, for one of the technical terms is the *trividha-dwára* or threefold door: "there are three entrances whence proceed that which is good and that which is evil—the body, the speech, and the mind" (Hardy's *Manual*, p. 494).

From the Buddhists it probably passed into classical Sanskrit literature; thus we find it in Manu's Institutes, XII. 4—10, "a rational creature has a reward or a punishment for mental acts, in his mind; for verbal acts, in his organs of speech; for corporeal acts, in his bodily frame;" and again, "he whose firm understanding obtains a command over his words, a command over his thoughts, and a command over his whole body, may justly be called a *tri-daṇḍin* (or triple commander)." Similarly there is a passage in Kálidása's Raghuvanśa, V. 5, where we find the same division applied to classify the threefold way in which the Hindu ascetic sought to purify his soul by a rigid course of ascetic discipline. King Raghu is accosted in his court by the disciple of a great ascetic, and the king asks whether the great teacher is well, and whether anything has happened to disturb his course of ascetic observances? "Is the threefold asceticism of the sage hindered by any obstacles—that asceticism which he accomplishes by his body, his voice, and his mind, and by which he alarms even Indra the king of the gods (lest he should even acquire merit and power superior to his own)?" We also often find it in the Mahábhárata. Thus in the story of Nala (III. § 65. 2563, 2572) Damayantí says, "even in my childhood I have never done evil in deed, mind, or speech" (*karmaṇá manasá váchá*); and in XII. 4059, "they who do no evil by deed, or mind, or speech, pass beyond all trouble, transferring their pains to others."

The same division occurs in the Zendavesta; as in the Gáthá Ahunavaiti, III. 3, "the twin spirits, each of a peculiar activity,—the good and the base in thought, word, and deed;" cf. also I. 1; V. 5; VI. 2.

We also find it among the Manicheans, in their tria signacula described by Augustine in his De Moribus Manichæorum, X. "quæ sunt tandem tria ista signacula? Oris certè et

manuum et sinus. Quid est hoc? ut ore et manibus et sinu castus et innocens sit homo. Cum *os*, inquit (M.), nomino, omnes sensus qui sunt in capite intelligi volo; cum autem *manum*, omnem operationem; cum *sinum*, omnem libidinem seminalem." The Greek church appears to have adopted this practice when a Manichean was received as a catechumen, as the priest *σφραγίζει τὸ μέτωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ στόμα καὶ τὸ στῆθος*. (See the formula Receptionis Manichæorum in Tollius.) Augustine finds fault with the division as being inaccurate and confused. But amongst the Manicheans two of these signacula seem to have assumed a more narrow and technical meaning, and Baur would explain the signaculum oris as the abstaining from eating flesh and the signaculum manuum as abstaining from injuring living creatures; but this seems a needless refinement, when we have Augustine's express testimony that the Manicheans of his time gave a higher and wider meaning to the phrases. No doubt a thorough Manichean would include the limited meanings, as Manicheism borrowed much of the Buddhist *ahinsá*, but, like Buddhism, it would not confine itself to them, but would aim at addressing and satisfying the common conscience of mankind.

We might perhaps be justified in supposing that the Manicheans derived it from the Persians or the Buddhists; but it is not so easy to determine whether these derived it from the Brahmans; and the question arises, are we obliged to suppose that it was borrowed by any? Could it not have been invented by any people which had eyes to examine their own consciousness?

The passage I have already quoted from Plato, though it is used there as a psychological rather than an ethical division, is very closely connected with the ethical application. The two modes of looking at human actions inevitably run into each other, and we can easily conceive that Plato's words might suggest the ethical use to any one who was versed in his expressions. Now Plato is clearly free from any Buddhist influence. Buddha is now supposed to have died B.C. 477, and therefore we are quite safe in maintaining an independent division here. I do not think that Plato ever again recurs to the division; he

was too much preoccupied with his own favourite threefold division of the soul into *τὸ λογιστικόν*, *τὸ θυμοειδές*, and *τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν*. Nor did the seed so casually sown germinate on Greek soil, as I have looked for it in vain among the Stoics or in the Roman writers. But it did not fall barren. This division of thought, word and deed, first started by Plato in the Protagoras, reappears in Alexandria, and becomes a favourite mode of expression among the Hellenized Jews of that great centre. Thus in the Septuagint translation of Deut. xxx. 14 we read, *ὅτι ἐγγύς σου ἐστὶ τὸ ῥῆμα σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσί σου ποιεῖν αὐτό*, where the original has only, "but the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it."

כִּי־קָרוֹב אֵלֶיךָ הַדָּבָר מְאֹד בְּפִיךָ וּבִלְבָבְךָ לַעֲשֹׂתוֹ׃

Eben Ezra in his Commentary seems to adopt a very similar interpretation[1]; but it is interesting to see that St Paul, in Romans x. 8, corrects the Septuagint in his quotation, *ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου*. The Septuagint rendering however became a locus classicus with Philo, and he continually quotes it as his authority for this threefold ethical division. Thus in the treatise 'quod omnis probus liber' (Tauchnitz ed. Vol. v. 296) he says:

Καίτοι τίς ἡ μακρᾶς ὁδοιπορίας ἢ τοῦ θαλαττεύειν ἐστὶ χρεία πρὸς ἔρευναν καὶ ζήτησιν ἀρετῆς, ἧς τὰς ῥίζας ὁ ποιῶν οὐ μακράν, ἀλλ' οὕτωσὶ πλησίον ἐβάλλετο; καθάπερ καὶ ὁ σοφὸς τῶν Ἰουδαίων νομοθέτης φησίν, "Ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσί σου," αἰνιττόμενος διὰ συμβόλων λόγους, πράξεις, βουλάς, ἃ δὴ πάντα γεωργικῆς τέχνης δεῖται. Cf. Vol. II. 23, de post. Caini.

Elsewhere he generally uses Plato's word *διάνοια* for *βουλή*, as in III. 321, *ταῦτα δὲ εὑρήσεις, οὐ μακρὰς καὶ ἀτριβεῖς διεξιὼν ὁδούς...ἀλλ' ἥ, φησι Μωϋσῆς, ἐγγὺς οὕτωσὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν παρίδρυταί σοι καὶ συμπέφυκε, τρισὶ τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις μέρεσιν ἡρμοσμένον, "καρδίᾳ, στόματι, χερσί," τὸ δ' ἔστι διανοίᾳ, λόγῳ,*

[1] שכל מצוות עקרם הלב ויש מהם זכר בפה לחזוק הלב ויש מעשה כדי שיזכור בפה.

πράξεσιν, ἐπειδὴ τὰ καλὰ καὶ φρονεῖν καὶ λέγειν καὶ ποιεῖν ἀναγκαῖον, συμπληρούμενα ἔκ τε εὐβουλίας καὶ εὐπραξίας καὶ εὐλογίας. (Cf. also in v. 245). In III. 217, de Mutatione nominum, we have it applied to a division of sins, with a similar reference to Deuteronomy: σχεδὸν τοίνυν καὶ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα καὶ τὰ κατορθώματα συμβέβηκεν ἐν τρισὶν ἐξετάζεσθαι, διανοίᾳ, λόγοις, πράξεσιν.

In III. 74, de Congressu quær. erud. gratia, § 1, he uses the division without any mention of the Old Testament: ἀρετὴ δὲ οὐ διαλείπουσα ἀνελλιπῶς δὲ καὶ ἀδιαστάτως κατὰ τοὺς ἀμερεῖς χρόνους ἀεὶ γεννᾷ, βρέφη μὲν οὐδαμῶς, λόγους δὲ ἀστείους καὶ βουλὰς ἀνεπιλήπτους καὶ ἐπαινετὰς πράξεις.

In v. 135, de Judice, § 3, he seems to have the same division in his mind when he explains the Urim and Thummim, or, as in the Sept., τὴν δήλωσιν καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν,—ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν λόγων εἰκόνας, ἐνδιαθέτου τε καὶ προφορικοῦ. Δεῖται γὰρ ὁ μὲν προφορικὸς δηλώσεως, ᾗ τὰ ἀφανῆ τῶν καθ' ἕκαστον ἡμῶν ἐνθύμια γνωρίζεται τῷ πέλας· ὁ δὲ ἐνδιάθετος ἀληθείας, εἰς τελείοτητα βίου καὶ πράξεων, δι' ὧν ἐπ' εὐδαιμονίαν ὁδὸς ἀνευρίσκεται.

The same division had indeed been all but directly expressed in the 139th Psalm, "Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising; thou understandest my thoughts afar off. Thou compassest my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether." Here we have the thoughts, the actions, and the words described, but we miss the sharply-defined division into three; nor is it more clearly brought out in Hosea vii. 1, 2.

Common as the phrase thus is in Philo, it does not seem to have obtained general currency in the early Christian Church, though the Sept. rendering of Deuteronomy xxx. 14 must have often brought it before the readers of that version. It is found however in the opening prayer of the liturgy of St Mark (Renaudot, Lit. Orient. Coll. I. p. 132), εἴτι σοι ἡμάρτομεν ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἔργῳ ἢ κατὰ διάνοιαν. This liturgy belongs to the early part of the third century, and was used by the Church of Alexandria. Origen also several times employs the phrase in his

treatise against Celsus. Thus in p. 200 (Spencer's ed.) we have *ὡς οὐ μόνον λόγων καὶ ἔργων, ἀλλὰ καὶ διαλογισμῶν κριθησομένων*; and again, *ἡ διάληψις περὶ τοῦ πάντ' ἐφορᾷν ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεὸν τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν λεγόμενα καὶ πραττόμενα ἀλλὰ καὶ λογιζόμενα.* The same division also occurs in p. 241, l. 5, where he explains the wood, hay, stubble, of 1 Cor. iii. 12, as *ἡ διὰ τῶν πράξεων καὶ λόγων καὶ νοημάτων οἰκοδομή*; and again in p. 273, l. 8, *οἱ μέντοι τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀκολουθοῦντες καὶ μεμελετηκότες αὐτοῦ συνωδὰ τοῖς λόγοις φρονεῖν καὶ λέγειν καὶ ποιεῖν.*

There are very few Patristic commentaries on Deut., but Theodoretus in his Quæstiones in Deuteronomium quotes xxx. 14, and adds, *δηλοῖ δὲ διὰ τοῦ στόματος τὴν τῶν θείων λογίων μελέτην· διὰ δὲ τῆς καρδίας τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς προθυμίαν· διὰ δὲ τῶν χειρῶν τὴν πρᾶξιν τῶν ἐντολῶν.* Augustine twice notices the discrepancy between the Sept. and St Paul. Once in his 'Liber de Natura et Gratia,' where after quoting Romans x., "Prope te est verbum in ore tuo et in corde tuo," he adds "*quod hic habet* (sc. Deut. according to LXX.) *in manibus tuis,* in corde enim sunt spirituales manus;" and again in his Quæstiones in Deuteronomium he says, "deinde quod hic additum est *et in manibus tuis;* non ait Apostolus nisi *in ore tuo et in corde tuo.* Et hoc usque in finem exsecutus est, dicens *corde enim creditur ad justitiam, ore autem confessio fit ad salutem.* Merito quod ex Hebræo translatum est, quantum a nobis inspici potuit, non habet *in manibus tuis.* Nec frustra tamen hoc a Septuaginta interpretibus additum existimo; nisi quia intelligi voluerunt (sc. the other interpreters?) etiam ipsas manus, quibus significantur opera, in corde accipi debere, ubi est fides quæ per dilectionem operatur. Nam si forinsecus ea quæ Deus jubet, manibus fiant et in corde non fiant, nemo est tam insulsus qui præcepta arbitretur impleri. Porro si caritas, quæ plenitudo est Legis, habitet in corde, etiamsi manibus corporis quisquam non possit operari, pax illi est utique cum hominibus bonæ voluntatis."

These objections are not the same which he had urged against the 'tria signacula' of the Manicheans. There his objections were rather verbal quibbling, as *e.g.* when he objected writing something evil, which, as far as it *significando peccat,* should belong to the 'peccata oris,' but yet must belong to the

'peccata manus.' He also concludes by objecting to the division as new: "videtisne quomodo novitatis appetitio, comite errore, in magnas deducatur angustias? Tribus namque istis signaculis, quæ *nova quadam divisione* prædicatis, quomodo includatis omnium peccatorum purgationem non invenitis."

I would thus briefly sum up the facts as far as I have been able to collect them. The ethical division in question is found in the later Vedic period of Sanskrit literature, and is therefore in India of Brahmanical origin; but it never attained any great currency in India until it was adopted by Buddhism. After this period we find it frequently used in the classical Sanskrit authors. It also appears in the Zendavesta, and from Persia it passed to the Manicheans.

In Europe it appears first in Plato's Protagoras, but here again it never attained any currency, until it was brought forward by those Jews who endeavoured to unite Jewish faith and Hellenic culture. But it was a division which was not wholly strange to the Jewish mind, as several places in the Old Testament could readily suggest it to a thinking reader. It does not seem to have been adopted by any early Christian writers except those of the Alexandrian school, and Augustine evidently thought it an unphilosophical division. Its popularity with the Manicheans would no doubt tend to throw it into discredit, but its adoption in the confession of pope Damasus, and subsequently in the Gregorian mass, can surely be sufficiently accounted for by its presence in the Sept. and Philo, without our having to assume that the Church borrowed it from the Manicheans. We are all familiar with the phrase from its use in the Confession in the Communion Service, and in Bishop Ken's morning hymn,

> Direct, control, suggest this day
> All I design, or do, or say.

Its adoption in the liturgy of pope Damasus may be paralleled by the adoption in our own liturgy of the old Peripatetic division of τὰ ἀγαθά into τὰ περὶ ψυχήν, τὰ περὶ σῶμα, and τὰ ἐκτός, which reappears in the well-known phrase of "afflicted in mind, body, or estate."

E. B. COWELL.

THE EASTERN ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN PSEUDEPIGRAPHIC WRITINGS.

THE Apocryphal writings may be divided into three classes; first, those anterior to the Christian era; second, those written in the centuries immediately following the coming of our Lord; third, those written or interpolated by Christians at a later period.

When the primeval simplicity of the Patriarchal and Mosaic law had been corrupted by that admixture of Chaldæan and Cabbalistic science which, with later additions from the Greek Philosophy, formed the basis of the Rabbinical or esoteric laws, the teachers of this doctrine sought to sanction it in the eyes of the unlearned by the authority of the most ancient and revered names. Hence arose the first class of Pseudepigraphic writings, such as the Book of Enoch, the *Oratio Josephi*, and other works of which only a few fragments have come down to us. Subsequently, and especially during the reign of Adrian, a reaction took place against the corrupted Alexandrine Judaism, and all writings impregnated with Greek ideas were zealously suppressed by the Talmudic doctors. In the second century an effort was made both by Jews and Christians to supply this loss, and we accordingly find an immense number of Pseudepigraphic writings springing up at about this date. It will not be necessary here to mention the exclusively Jewish productions, such as the סֵפֶר יְצִירָה ascribed to Rabbi Achiva, a learned doctor of the time of Adrian, as our business is with the Christian writers of that age. The aim of the two classes of Christians who seem to have adopted the artifice of promulgating their views under the sanction of ancient and sacred names was identical, although they acted from opposite motives. The one class wished to reconcile Christianity with Judaism, regarding it as a

fulfilment of the Law; the other desired to oppose Christianity as true to Judaism as false; but it was equally necessary for the purpose of both to prove the antiquity of the Messianic faith. To these causes we must chiefly look for the origin of the Pseudepigraphic writings, but there is yet another consideration which may assist us in determining their nature and mutual relationship. We know what a tangled web of tradition was woven around the patriarchal history, until the simplicity and truth of the original was almost obscured by the Talmudic accounts. In fact, the tendency in the East has always been thus to elaborate the facts recorded in Holy Writ, and form a second or traditional history, which by the vulgar is accepted even more readily than the first. We can easily imagine therefore that a history of such vital importance as that of our Lord would hardly escape a similar corruption. The Eastern Christians would love to dwell upon the minutest details of His life, they would, in their zeal to assert His divine nature, be unwilling to admit that any incident of that life was without its distinctive and miraculous character, and above all, they would be, perhaps insensibly, loth to abandon their national traditions and prejudices, and would leave no means untried for reconciling the latter with the faith which their hearts and convictions compelled them to confess. In this way a secondary and traditional Gospel History did spring up, and the identity of many incidents in the various Apocryphal Gospels which have reached us, as well as the general similarity of tone observable in them all, would seem to indicate that they are not so much the productions of individual persons and times as remnants of a once popular, and if I may use the expression, *parasitic* account. This will account for the fact that such of these writings as have been preserved in their Eastern versions, Carshunic, Arabic or Syriac, are always more full and accurate than the Greek, although probably posterior to these in date. The Greek writers, who took their accounts from the current traditions of the Eastern Church, would naturally reject much that did not appeal so strongly to a Western mind, which however the Eastern translator would as naturally again supply from his own national lore. Accordingly we find that the Oriental versions do often

illustrate and explain the Greek texts in a remarkable manner. A collation of the texts of the Apocalypses of Moses, John, or St Paul, of the *Transitus Mariæ* or other Apocrypha with the Carshunic or Syriac versions will at once convince the scholar of the truth of this statement. Another indication of the existence of this esoteric history in a continuous if not actually written form[1] is found in the similarity of style exhibited by all of the Apocrypha, and in the fact that the traditions alluded to in them are referred to as well known on all hands. Thus in the Testament of Adam and the Apocalypse of Peter, &c. constant reference is made to the mysteries concealed in the Book of Seth which was said to have been deposited together with the offerings of the magi in the Cave of Treasures مغارة الكنوز, a story that had become a necessary part of the machinery of every chronography which pretended to go back to the origin of all things.

Other traditions which are current in the East seem, on the other hand, to have had their origin in a misinterpretation of the words of the New Testament writers. I cannot but believe, for instance, that the Mohammedan legend of the two rebellious angels Harút and Marút, who are said to be confined in a pit at Babel, is founded on the passage in the 2nd Epistle of St Peter, c. ii. v. 4: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." The word *hell* in this passage having probably been rendered by שאול in the early Eastern version would easily give rise to the legend, for this word is used to signify hell, a pit or the grave in the Hebrew Scriptures. The two angels of the Mohammedan legend

[1] It is not improbable however that some such work may have existed as a complete apocryphal scripture history. The first eight chapters of the Apocalypse of St Peter (a work written in Arabic and ascribed to Clement) seem little more than a digest of some such work. In this many traditions are found, expressed in almost the same words as in the Testament of Adam; and the last named work, there is good reason to believe, is formed of fragments from some earlier one. Cedrenus in his Chronology, quoting a passage which exactly corresponds with the extant Fragments of the Testament of Adam, distinctly states that he has extracted it from two books, the Life of Adam and the Minor Genesis.

are imprisoned, الي يوم الدين, an expression which exactly corresponds with the Apostle's words, ἕως τῆς κρίσεως. Whether the Apostle is here quoting from the book of Enoch, as many imagine, or not, it shews how pertinaciously national traditions linger about the locality where they had birth and would seem to give additional weight to the supposition that they were incorporated in the legendary history whose existence I have supposed.

There are other characteristics of the Apocryphal writings which, although not throwing much light on their origin, point to a special localization of them in the Eastern Church. These are 1st. The Mariolatry exhibited by them all, and that too of the intense character which has distinguished the Eastern and especially the Syrian Church down to the latest time. 2nd. The account of the destination of the Apostles as given in the book of Enoch, exactly accords with the received account in the Nestorian Church. A collection of Syrian christian poems, written in Arabic, in the 16th or 17th century, by a monk of Lebanon named Gabriel, and another similar book of poems by Al Khúrí Nicholas present the same features as those which characterise the Apocryphal writings; the ode of Gabriel upon the fate of the Twelve Apostles, might have been suggested immediately by the Book of Enoch. 3rd. The fragmentary Latin and Greek versions of the Pseudepigraphic writings present the same *order* as the Carshunic. For example, a Latin version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is preceded in the MS by the "Death of Adam" and appears to have been translated or abridged from some complete collection of Apocryphal Books. 4th. The allusions and traditions contained in these works are such as would more naturally linger in the Eastern than in the Western Church.

From these considerations, I should infer that in the earliest ages of the Eastern Church, a legendary and popular history of Our Lord was already springing up beside, and parallel with the Gospel account, which with a tendency to Christianize more decidedly the Old Testament History and Prophecies had assumed a definite and generally accepted form; and that the authors of the Apocryphal Books of various ages which have

come down to us, drew their materials from this source, while they elaborated them according to their individual idiosyncrasies or the tenets of the sect whose doctrines they desired to support.

The Eastern origin of the Apocryphal Books being once admitted will assist us materially in determining more accurately their several dates and authorship. To illustrate this, I will examine briefly a work which may be regarded as a fair type of the class, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, a work too the origin of which has been the subject of much disquisition, and many conflicting conjectures.

The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs belongs to the second of three classes, which I have enumerated at the commencement of this paper, namely, to the Apocryphal productions of the second century of the Christian Era. It consists of a series of discourses, put into the mouths of the Twelve Patriarchs the sons of Jacob and purporting to be their dying injunctions to their children. The Patriarchs are made to confess each the gravest errors of his life, and the discourses invariably conclude with a prophecy of our Lord's coming and mission. Now the fashion of inculcating moral precepts or promulgating philosophical speculations under the form of Testaments delivered by the illustrious personages of antiquity has long been prevalent in the East; it is with the Oriental Philosopher as much a stereotyped rhetorical artifice as the Dialogue was with the Greeks. The origin of this custom as Grabius has remarked in his Præfatio may no doubt be sought for in the idea to which Cicero gives expression in the words *divinare morientes*, and Holy Scripture furnishes many such instances in recording the dying words of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and other holy men. So also we have other Apocryphal Testaments ascribed to Adam, Moses, Joseph, &c. as well as many books in Arabic, and other Oriental languages composed on an exactly similar plan. Of these, I may instance the Jávídán Khirad of Abu'alí Maskawí, in which not only are certain moral precepts put into the mouth of Hosheng, one of the earliest kings of Persia, but Testaments attributed to nearly all the wise men of antiquity are contained in the same

volume. It is worthy, of note that the phrase *yà baní*, 'Oh my son,' is of constant occurrence, this according exactly with the use of the words τέκνιά μου in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. The word διαθήκη, is far less precise than *waçiyah*, which the Arabs use to designate this species of literature, and which is restricted to this one idea. The appropriate nature of such a formula would at once commend itself to the Pseudepigraphic writer as it seems to have done in the case of the book under consideration. There exists a similar Testamentary address of our Lord to His disciples on the Mount of Olives before His ascension, in an ancient Carshunic MS. in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. In this, after a series of precepts repeated from the Gospels, our Saviour is made to predict the future of His Church, and the fate of His disciples.

But besides the evidence of an Eastern origin, which is afforded by the form of such compositions, these peculiar dogmas and speculations enunciated in them conclusively establish their oriental character. It will at once appear to the student of Oriental Philosophy that a spirit of Gnosticism closely allied to the Persian system of mysticism pervades them all. The Testament of Adam, to which I have before referred, is called by Pope Gelasius in his decree, A. D. 494, "The *Penitence* of Adam," and by Epiphanius (*adv. Hæres.*) "The *Apocalypse* of Adam," and lastly it is spoken of by Cedrenus in the following words:—Ἀδὰμ τῷ ἑξακοσιοστῷ ἔτει μετανοήσας ἔγνω δι' ἀποκαλύψεως τὰ περὶ τῶν Ἐγρηγόρων καὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ, καὶ τὰ περὶ μετανοίας καὶ τῆς θείας σαρκώσεως καὶ περὶ τῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ὥραν ἡμερινὴν καὶ νυκτερινὴν ἀναπεμπομένων εὐχῶν τῷ θεῷ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων δι' Οὐριὴλ τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας ἀρχαγγέλου. "Adam in the six hundredth year of his age repented and knew by revelation the secrets of the Vigilants (the angels who dwelt on the earth before the Deluge, the 'Sons of God' spoken of in the Pentateuch) and of the Flood, and of Repentance, and the Divine Incarnation, and of the prayers offered up by all creatures each hour of the day and night, being taught these things by Uriel the Archangel of Repentance."

Now these expressions furnish a clue by which we may

arrive at an exact appreciation of the nature and origin of the book. The phrase *μετανοήσας ἔγνω δι' ἀποκαλύψεως* indicates a Gnostic source, for with these mystics the word *μετάνοια* came to be regarded as almost synonymous with *ἀποκάλυψις*, and it is in this sense that we find the Repentance of Origen, of St Cyprian, Mambrè, &c., and in this sense it is certainly employed in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. In the latter work each is made to express his *repentance* for the besetting sin of his life immediately before enunciating the prophecy which is put into his mouth. Cedrenus, in the passage quoted above, proceeds to describe the Universal Liturgy for every hour of the day and night in words which precisely correspond with the extant fragments of the Testament of Adam. This mystical division of the twenty-four hours is merely a reproduction of the ideas embodied in the *Jeschts Sadés* and *Sirouzè* of the Zend Avesta[1], from which most of the mystic doctrines of the Gnostics were borrowed, especially those of the Sabæan sect who are also called Mendaïtes, Nazarenes or Christians of St John, as they existed at the close of the fourth century. Now there are evident traces of this same Persic form of Gnosticism in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs; for example, the expression *φῶς γνώσεως* in Levi 18, the angelography, the allusion to the spirit of ecstasy (Reuben 1), *ἔκστασις καὶ εἰκὼν θανάτου*, which is the same as the *Hâl* of the modern Persian mystics. Reference is also made to the Tabula Cæli, an idea which has pervaded the whole system of Oriental Mysticism whether in its Sabæan, Zoroastrian, or Mohammedan form. The لوح وقلم the Tablets of Eternity, on which the Pen, i.e. the Spirit of God, wrote the Order of the Universe, is still a common-place with the Sufis, a sect of Mystic Philosophers who, though existing amongst the Mahommedans, borrow most of their doctrines from the same source as the Christian Gnostics themselves. This Persian Mysticism, becoming subsequently strongly impregnated with Greek Ethics and Egyptian superstition, did not for some time

[1] Ernest Renan, Fragmens du livre Gnostique intitulé Testament d'Adam, p. 11.

assume the formidable aspect which appeared in the later Essene and Elchasaitic sect, though it seems to have found favour in the very earliest ages of the church amongst both classes of Judaizing Christians, the Nazarenes, and the Ebionites. In the first and second centuries both these sects maintained much more of their Jewish character though in an entirely different degree and manner. The former, to quote Dr Lightfoot's words, "held themselves bound to the Mosaic Ordinances, rejecting however all Pharisaical interpretations and additions. Nevertheless they did not consider the Gentile Christians under the same obligations, or refuse to hold communion with them; and in the like spirit is this distinguished from all other Judaizing sectarians. They fully recognized the work and mission of St Paul..... They were distinguished from other Judaizing sects by a loftier conception of the Person of Christ, and by a frank recognition of the liberty of the Gentile churches, and the commission of the Gentile Apostles. These distinguishing features may be traced to the lingering influences of the teaching of the Apostles of the Circumcision. To the example of these same Apostles also they might have appealed in defending their rigid observances of the Mosaic law. But herein while copying the letter, they did not copy the spirit of their model; for they took no account of altered circumstances."

Now these are just the points which distinguish the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs from other writings which bear the impress of Gnosticism. The Levitical sympathies of the author, his respect for the Jewish Hierarchy generally, his constant thanksgiving for the admission of Gentiles to the Covenant, and above all his prophecy of the birth and mission of St Paul (Benjamin 11), are ideas so eminently characteristic of the early Nazarene sect, as strongly to support the theory advanced by Ritschl, and supported by Dr Lightfoot, that the author was a Judaizing Christian of the Nazarene persuasion. But it would be tedious were I to point out the innumerable instances of Orientalism which appear in the several Pseudepigraphic writings. The theory which I am desirous of establishing, and which I believe will be borne out by an impartial

consideration of almost any one of these works, is that they are not merely isolated tracts, and the invention of individuals, but portions of a Cyclic narrative of the events of Sacred History, which if it did not actually exist in the shape of a complete written work, at least formed a harmonious traditional whole originating in the East, and accepted as an authentic scripture by the early Eastern Church.

E. H. PALMER.

PROF. MUNRO'S NOTES ON JUVENAL I. 13, AND ON AETNA 590.

THESE two notes deal with the same question, whether a causal ablative of the person can be used without the preposition. The note on Juv. I. 13, may be found in Mr Mayor's *Juvenal*, p. 93, 2nd ed., and is in explanation of

adsiduo ruptae lectore columnae.

The latter occurs in Prof. Munro's *Aetna*, p. 77, in explanation of

extinctosque suo Phrygas Hectore.

The sum of the former is that the ablative may stand without a preposition, if accompanied by an adjective; that we may say *adsiduo lectore ruptae*, because it is equivalent to *lectoris adsiduitate*, but not *lectore ruptae*. Of the latter, that the bare ablative may be used if it is equivalent to *per*; hence *extinctos suo Phrygas Hectore* = *per extinctum H.* = *extinctos extincto Hectore*, or to use a form suggested in the former note = *τῷ Hectore extincto*. It is obvious that *ab Hectore* would not do here.

This explanation would be unexceptionable, if it covered every case of the disputed ablative. It is virtually that of Scaliger, who explained scriberis Vario Maeonii carminis alite as = *cum V. Maeonii carminis ales sit*. But, I venture to think, that Prof. Munro is nearer the mark when he makes Juv. III. 240, *ingenti Liburno* = VI. 351, *ingenti vehitur cervice Syrorum*. For his analysis of the adjective with a noun will not suit a passage like Hor. *Epist.* I. 19, 12 sqq.:

> *Si quis*, voltu torvo ferus et pede nudo
> Exiguaeque togae *simulet textore* Catonem,

where there is no adjective to analyse. *Textore* seems rightly rendered by Prof. Lincoln of Boston, *by the help of his tailor*, or, *thanks to his tailor*. Nor will the analysis apply where the adjective is not a predicate, but merely ornamental, as in Statius, *Ach.* I. 219:

per undas
an magno Tritone ferat.

Here *Tritone* really = *Monstro*, and denotes the mechanical means of transit. But this latter passage leads to a solution which will suit every case, viz., that *ab* must be used with either person or thing if we wish to call attention to the original source of the action, but that the bare ablative, with or without an adjective or participle, may be used to denote instrumentality either of person or thing, animate or inanimate, and that whether the animate being be purely passive, as in Juv. XIV. 74:

serpente ciconia pullos
nutrit et inventa per devia rura lacerta;

or an ἔμψυχον ὄργανον, like the tall chairman in Juvenal III. Both usages in the case of inanimate things occur in Ovid, *Art.* I. 723:

Candidus in nauta turpis color, aequoris unda
Debet et a radiis sideris esse niger,

as we would say by the action of the sun's rays on the water; the sun, to speak popularly, being the more efficient agent of the two. In the same way, *ib.* 510:

a nulla tempora comptus acu,

a expresses strongly the agency of the curling pin, it was to no pin, to no dressing that he owed his success. There is therefore nothing mysterious in the combination of *ab* with the person or thing in certain cases: it still preserves its strict force of *on the part of*, either in time, space, or action; a force which will, I think, take off, elegance apart, every usage of *ab*. Hence the propriety of omitting that preposition in the instances collected by Mr Munro and Mr Mayor. Take, for example, jacent suis

testibus, Cic. *pro Mil.* 47, by the involuntary admissions of their own witnesses, whereas a suis testibus = by their direct evidence, and so suis testibus = their reluctant evidence on cross-examination. If this distinction be sound, in Hor. *C.* II. 12, 27:

quae poscente magis gaudeat eripi,

poscente must be governed by *magis*, as in such a case the postulant could be neither reluctant nor unconscious.

Some of what Mr Paley calls Propertian ablatives may be explained in this way, viz., III. 26. 91:

et modo formosa quam multa Lycoride Gallus mortuus,

done to death, not by the malice of Lycoris, but by her fatal beauty. So IV. 14. 30:

Nec digitum angusta est inseruisse via,

because the way is crowded. So IV. 6. 24:

Si placet insultet Lygdame morte mea,

Let my death be food for his mockery.

As to the so-called dative of the agent, I do not believe in its existence. Every instance alleged will turn out to be a Dativus commodi. The dative of the consecrator after verbs of consecration is a good illustration. In the examples collected by Orelli on Tacitus *Germ.* 3, aram Ulixi consecratam, viz., *Ann.* XV. 41, aedes Statoris Jovis Romulo vota; Suet. *Oct.* 1, ara Octavio consecrata; *Jul.* 88, ludos consecratos ei, sc. *ab eo Veneri Genetrici*, the dative seems to denote that the foundation will enure to the memory or benefit of the mortal founder, the real agent or final cause of the consecration being the God or Hero[1]. Virgil has:

Causam lacrumis sacraverat aras

[1] Conington on Verg. *G.* I. 14, says: "cui seems to imply that the process goes on for him, because he is its patron and author, thus denoting causation indirectly. Comp. II. 5. So Lucr. I. 7, 8." But in all these passages the notion is strictly that the divine agency is manifested in the works which suggest to us the notion of the divine agent, who thus receives due honour at our hands. So in *G.* III. 16, in medio mihi Caesar erit tem-

= arae consecratae lacrumanti = to Hector as a relief for the tears of Andromache. This in Greek would be *ἐπὶ δάκρυσι*, as in Eurip. *Hipp.* 32:

> Ἱππολύτῳ δ' ἔπι
> τὸ λοιπὸν ὠνόμαζεν ἱδρῦσθαι θεάν

= in the name of Hippolytus, and the dedication would run ΙΠΠΟΛΥΤΟΣ ΚΥΠΡΙΔΙ. Similarly, in the legend from Philostratus *V. Ap.* I. 16, p. 19, quoted by Mr Munro in his *Aetna*, p. 41, *κυπαρίττου τι ἔρνος ἡ γῆ ἀναδέδωκεν ἐπὶ Κυπαρίττῳ φασὶν ἐφήβῳ Ἀσσυρίῳ* = which bears the name Cyparissus. And in Tac. *Agr.* 2, Cum Aruleno Rustico Paetus Thrasea, Herennio Senecioni Priscus Helvidius laudati essent, the dative means, when Rusticus and Senecio had had the ill-luck to praise, or something of the sort.

Passages however occur in which the ablative of the noun without either adjective or participle is a genuine modal or conditional ablative. So, lumina morte resignat, rightly explained by Turnebus, La Cerda and Henry as *in death*, *τῆς* morte *ὑπαρχοίσης*. So, Caesar, *B. G.* I. 18, imperio R. Populi, which is evidently opposed to si quid accidat Romanis, *ib.* supr., and therefore = *τοῦ* imperio P. R. *ὑπάρχοντος*; and perhaps, Lucr. III. 928:

> Maior enim turbae disiectus materiai
> Consequitur leto,

leto = *τοῦ* leto *ὑπάρχοντος*.

The distinction between the accusative with *per*, and the bare ablative of the person amounts to this, that *per* keeps up the notion of a delegated task, while the bare ablative of the person points out that the person is either by his presence or absence a necessary condition of the result. Both forms agree in this, that they exclude altogether from the person specified the notion of any initiative as principal.

THOMAS MAGUIRE.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, GALWAY.

plumque tenebit, mihi = I shall be immortalised as the dedicator of Caesar's temple; and in ib. v. 19, mihi = I shall be celebrated as the means of gathering all Greece together in Caesar's name.

THE ROMAN CAPITOL, AS LAID DOWN IN MR BURN'S "ROME AND THE CAMPAGNA."

THE recent discoveries on the Palatine Hill, due to the liberality and literary taste of Napoleon III., have given a new impulse to Roman topography; hence the more recent works on the subject excel their predecessors in interest. This beautiful book does credit to the spirit of the publishers; the subject has at last found a form worthy of it. The wood engravings are exquisite, and represent with vivid reality some of the most interesting scenes in the eternal city. It is only to be regretted that the author does not seem to have been aware of the private house discovered on the Palatine in May 1869. As belonging to one of the few remains of the republican period it is highly interesting, and still more so because in it, together with the house of Asinius Pollio, also recently discovered near the Baths of Caracalla, we have the only vestiges at Rome of the private life of the Romans. In its style, the house resembles, but excels, those of Pompeii; and some views of it, from the photographs published by Cav. Rosa, would have been a valuable addition to Mr Burn's book.

I do not propose to enter here into any general criticism of Mr Burn's work. The following remarks are confined to the question of the Capitoline temple, which the author appears to think he has satisfactorily settled.

At p. 185 Mr Burn observes that there are some few passages of ancient writers relating to this question "which have never been fairly discussed, and these appear to point so plainly to the conclusion that the Capitoline temple must have been on the south-western height, that it seems surprising to find the contrary any longer maintained."

But, if these passages have never been "fairly discussed," that might be an apology for those who, until now, have held the contrary; though they can plead no such excuse after reading Mr Burn's remarks on them, in which, for the first time, they are submitted to a fair discussion. We will therefore endeavour to follow, with the greatest attention and impartiality, the three "decisive arguments" by which Mr Burn has convinced himself that the Capitoline temple was on the south-western height.

i. "In the first place," Mr Burn proceeds, "the evidence derived from the bridge of Caligula, mentioned by Suetonius (*Cal.* 22), seems decisive as to the situation of the Temple of Jupiter. Suetonius says that Caligula in his madness imagined that he held conversations with the Capitoline Jupiter, and used to whisper in his ear, and apply his own ear to the lips of the statue for an answer. He is said to have threatened to expel Jupiter from the Capitol unless he listened to his advances, and the monarch of gods was at last obliged to appease the Emperor's anger by inviting him to share his temple. Caligula then, in order to connect his palace with the temple, built a bridge across the intervening valley over the temple of Augustus. Now it is allowed on all hands that this bridge could not have been thrown across to the height of Ara Celi, as it would then have passed over a part of the Forum, and no alternative is therefore left us but to conclude that it was carried from the northern corner of the Palatine to the Caffarelli height, and that the Temple of Jupiter stood upon that height."

To this passage is appended the following note: "It was plainly the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter to which Caligula made his bridge, and Dr Dyer is mistaken in contradicting Becker, *Dict. Geogr.* II. p. 766."

This is only the lady's argument, "it must be so, because I know it is." To retort it is to refute it, and needs only the counter-assertion—if it would not be rude—that Mr Burn is mistaken in supporting Becker. For, putting aside the assertion, he has not thrown a single new ray of light on the question. He does nothing but advance the old arguments.

One of these is, that the bridge could not have been carried to Ara Celi, because in that case it must have crossed the Forum. And what then? The only proof that it did not is that this is "allowed on all hands." Because, I suppose, that such a bridge would have been more difficult or unsightly than one to the S.W. height. Granted. But who shall say what a madman with all the world at his feet might have done? Are we to make him "cum ratione insanire."

This objection alone suffices to prevent Mr Burn's argument from being "decisive." At the same time it may be admitted to be more probable—that is all—that the bridge was thrown from the Palatine to the S.W. height. But, when this is granted, by what art of divination does Mr Burn jump to his conclusion that, in that case, no other alternative is left but that the Temple of Jupiter must have been upon that height? He might at least have communicated the process, and so have taken us with him.

For my part I can imagine more than one alternative. I still hold that the true interpretation of the passage in Suetonius is, that the bridge was thrown from one *hill* to the other. Had Suetonius meant what Mr Burn asserts, he would have said "Palatium templumque Capitolinum conjunxit." That he uses *Palatium* and *Capitolium* for the hills, I have shown from his Life of Augustus (c. 29): "Templum Apollinis in Palatio (extruxit) aedem Tonantis Jovis in Capitolio;" where it is impossible but that the hills must be meant. Indeed Mr Burn allows this sense of the words, and even himself translates, in the passage first quoted, that the bridge "was carried from the northern corner *of the Palatine* to the Caffarelli *height*."

How, then, does this prove that the temple was on that height? To do this, Mr Burn must assume that he knows precisely the direction and length of the bridge; that it began at the palace, and ended at the entrance of the Capitoline temple, on the Caffarelli height. Now what is this but a begging of the whole question?

Assuming for the moment that the temple was on the Ara Celi height, there are two ways in which Caligula might have got to it.

First: the bridge might have proceeded across the back of the Capitoline Hill to the north-east summit. Those who have walked through the covered bridge at Florence leading from the Pitti Palace to the Uffizi, and even crossing the Arno—a route quite as long, if not longer and describing an angle—will admit that there is nothing improbable in this.

Secondly: after landing on the south-west height, Caligula might have walked to the north-east height. And that this is not improbable appears from what Suetonius proceeds to say, but which Mr Burn does not quote: "Mox quo propior esset, in area Capitolina novæ domus fundamenta jecit." Caligula therefore was by no means content with his bridge, and the further the temple was off the more reason would he have had for his discontentment.

This argument from the bridge, then, so far from being decisive, affords at best a mere presumption, which must utterly vanish before any stronger presumptions that can be produced in favour of the opposite height.

ii. Mr Burn's second decisive argument runs as follows: "A second argument, which appears strongly to support the same conclusion, may be drawn from Cicero's account of the statue of Jupiter Capitolinus. The Capitol had been struck by lightning, and the statues and other works of art, especially that of the Capitoline Jupiter, placed on a column, had been much injured. The Haruspices, when consulted as to the means to be taken in order to avert the calamities thus portended, advised that a larger statue of Jupiter should be made and placed on a higher pedestal, and that the face should be turned towards the East, "in the hope that if the statue which *you see before you*," says Cicero, addressing the people in the Forum from the Rostra, "should overlook the Forum and Curia, the designs of traitors against the state would be brought to light and discovered." The alteration, he adds, had only just been completed during his own consulship, and on the same day the Catilinarian conspiracy had been detected.

"If we place the statue on the Ara Celi height, and draw a line eastwards from it, the line will not pass through any part of the Forum; whereas, if turned to the South, it would have

overlooked at least that angle of the Forum where the Temple of Saturn stands. But by placing the statue on the Caffarelli height, with its face eastwards, it is at once seen that the Forum and Curia would lie nearly in a direct line opposite to it, and Cicero's words become at once intelligible. That the alteration of position was scientifically and carefully made cannot be doubted, as it was done under the inspection of the Haruspices, and in consequence of a general consultation among the most learned members of that body; and there is no reason whatever for supposing, as Preller does, that the orientation of the statue was not accurate. Dion Cassius, a careful and critical writer, gives exactly the same account of the change of position made in the statue. "It was made to face the East," he says, "and the Forum, in order that the conspiracies then causing so much agitation in Rome might be detected."

On this I would remark, is it so certain, to begin with, that Cicero is alluding to a statue of Jupiter *Capitolinus?* Mr Burn says in a note that in the passage alluded to (*In Catil.* III. 8. s. 20) the whole context shews that the statue of Jupiter Capitolinus is intended; and refers also to Cicero *De Div.* I. 12. s. 20, 21. I have carefully considered these passages, and do not see my way so clearly to the same conclusion. In the first passage the words employed are merely "simulacrum Jovis;" and though the god alluded to had no doubt the same attributes as the Capitoline Jove, he was not the Jupiter Capitolinus properly so called; for the statue of this god was in the interior of the temple. Nor is there anything in the passage from the *De Divinatione* which throws any further light upon the subject. The statue that was turned stood originally on a low column, so that it could not be seen from the Forum; the alteration consisted in putting it upon a higher one, and turning its face from the West to the East. Now from these indications it may be pretty safely inferred that it did not stand before the Capitoline temple, on whichever height we place that building; for as the temple faced the South, had the statue stood in front of it, it would surely have looked also to the South and not sideways, or askance either to the West or to the East. Jove was the

presiding deity of the whole hill, and in this capacity it seems not improbable that he may have been called the Tarpeian Jove, to whom Solinus refers when he says that the horses of the quadriga ran three times round him—not the temple, as Pliny says in adverting to the same occurrence ("relicto certamine ad Capitolium quadriga prosilivit, nec ante substitit quam Tarpeium Jovem trina dextratione lustrasset," p. 195, ed. Mommsen). It seems probable that it may have stood in the middle of the hill, in what has been called the intermontium; which however would be the lowest part of the summit: and this would account for the necessity of raising it on a higher column, to make it visible from the Forum. In like manner the colossal figure of Athene in the Acropolis of Athens stood quite detached from her temple, and fronted the west. If this was the position of Jupiter all difficulty about his view over the Forum and Curia would vanish at once; but also all arguments drawn from it as to the site of the temple.

We shall only add that the passage in Dio Cassius (XXXVII. 9) to which Mr Burn also refers, throws no further light upon the subject. Dio merely calls it a statue of Jove erected upon a column, and repeats Cicero's account of its being raised higher and turned from west to east (*ἄγαλμα Διὸς ἐπὶ κίονος ἱδρυμένον...καὶ τῷ Διὶ ἄγαλμα μεῖζον, πρός τε τὰς ἀνατολὰς καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀγορὰν βλέπον*). Nor can any argument be drawn from the following sections (21, 22) of the Catilinarian oration, where Cicero says that the work had been accomplished with the assent of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, and where pointing with dramatic effect to the statue now for the first time visible from the Forum—an arrangement no doubt purposely contrived by the eloquent consul in order to give point to his oration—he exclaims, "ille, ille Jupiter restitit." For Jupiter is there alluded to in his general character of best and greatest and guardian of the city.

But even if the statue on the column should be thought to have stood before the temple—a most awkward position for it—I still maintain my opinion that the north-east height, and not the south-west one, would best have afforded it a view of the

Curia and Forum. Mr Burn, however, selects the latter, and contending that the statue must have been scientifically placed, holds that a line drawn eastwards from it with mathematical accuracy would pass through the Forum and Curia; whereas had the statue been on the Ara Celi height, the line would not have touched the Forum at all.

Before we can consider this point about the orientation of the statue, it is necessary to determine the exact position of the temple before which it is supposed to have stood. We know in a general way that it faced the south; but as Mr Burn observes, p. 189, rules about the orientation and arrangement of buildings must always be considered as subordinate to the exigencies of the site; and that "doubtless when these rules proved inconvenient the ancient augurs had many ways of evading them." Whence it appears that though they were so mathematically strict about the orientation of a statue (which is necessary for Mr Burn's argument), they were somewhat lax about what might be considered the more important position of a temple, which is also necessary for Mr Burn's argument.

The augurs being thus somewhat lax about the site, I will suggest the probability that the front of the temple, instead of looking due south, may have inclined rather to the south-west. My reasons for thinking this possible, nay even probable, are, drawn first: from the configuration of the Capitoline Hill which lies in a direction from north-east to south-west; and therefore temples placed in the same direction would harmonize better with the requirements of the site, than if placed as it were transversely and askew. Secondly: this view is corroborated by the remains of a very considerable temple, whatever it may be, discovered by recent excavations on the Caffarelli height, which according to Mr Burn's own admission (p. 188) looks to the south-west.

Now, if such was the situation of the great temple, and if the statue stood before the main entrance—which, if it stood there at all, may be fairly presumed to have been the case—then I am afraid it would have had a very bad chance of being seen from the Forum, and a still worse of seeing the Curia.

For the south-east angle of the temple would have screened it completely.

If then we may vary at all from Dionysius' account that the temple faced the south, there are probable reasons that it may have faced the south-west, but none at all that it should have faced the south-east. At least Mr Burn has produced none; and yet he places the temple in that direction in the map at the end of his book; probably because it helped his theory.

Waiving however these objections, though I submit that they are neither unreasonable nor far fetched, I will meet Mr Burn on the ground selected by himself. Let the reader turn to the Iconographia Romæ Veteris at the end of Mr Burn's volume, and draw a line due east, according to the indicator at the side of the map, from the front of the Capitoline temple. When produced, it will be found that it only just touches quite the eastern extremity of the Forum, and runs very wide indeed of the church of S. Luca, the site of the ancient Curia, which was intended to be embraced in the altered position of the statue. These remarks, it is true, allow nothing for the sidelong power of the eye. But if that privilege is to be accorded to the left eye, supposing the statue stood on the south-west height, so also it must be granted to the right eye, if it occupied the north-east height: and thus, at best, the result is negative instead of decisive.

iii. We will now proceed to Mr Burn's third decisive argument; which is, that had the large Capitoline temple stood on the height of the Ara Celi, there would have been no room for the numerous temples and shrines which are also said to have been on that summit. Among these, says Mr Burn (p. 187), were the temples of Fides and Mens, which were large enough for meetings of the senate; and in proof of this, he refers to Appian (B. C. I. 16). On turning to Becker (p. 403) I find the same assertion made with regard to the temple of Fides, and on the same authority of Appian, with the addition of Valerius Maximus (III. 2. 17); but Becker says nothing about the temple of Mens being capable of containing the senate; though Mr Burn, for the sake, I suppose, of strengthening his

argument, brackets this with Fides, without referring to any other authority than Appian.

Now in the passage cited Appian says nothing whatever about the temple of Mens; and instead of showing that the temple of Fides, where the senate met in the Gracchan sedition, was on the Capitol, it proves precisely the reverse, as I shall presently show. But first of all I must quote some further remarks of Mr Burn's about this temple. At p. 192 he says: "The Temple of Fides is one of the larger and most frequently mentioned temples of the Capitol. It was first built by Numa, and then restored in the First Punic War by Atilius Calatinus and Æmilius Scaurus (Plut. Num. 16; Liv. I. 21; Cic. De Nat. D. II. 23). Meetings of the senate could be held in it, and it was here that during the Gracchan tumults the sitting was held when, gradually excited by vehement denunciatory speeches, the Senators at last rushed out, headed by Scipio Nasica, and murdered Tiberius Gracchus, near the statues of the seven kings, which stood at the door of the temple (App. B. C. I. 16; Val. Max. III. 2. 17)." And he subjoins: "The passages of Cicero and Appian which vouch for the temple's situation, are too distinct to be explained away."

All these passages are also quoted by Becker (loc. cit.) with the addition of Cicero, De Off. III. 29, of Dio Cassius[1] (XLV. 17), and the Fasti Amiterni, Kal. Oct. FIDEI IN CAPITOLIO. And to these I will add another from Pliny, which Becker does not seem to have been aware of: Spectata est et in aede Fidei in Capitolio (tabula) senis cum lyra puerum docentis (N. H. XXXV. s. 36. 100). Becker probably read the passages he quotes, for he was not very scrupulous about perverting or mutilating authorities in order to suit his theories. With regard to Mr Burn, the most charitable supposition is that he did not read them, but implicitly followed Becker, for whom he seems to have a great veneration.

It appears plainly enough from these passages that there was a temple of Faith on the Capitoline Hill; but it appears just as plainly, first, that it was not the temple built by Numa;

[1] Καὶ πνεῦμα μέγα ἐπιγενόμενον τάς τε στήλας τὰς περὶ τὸ Κρόνιον καὶ περὶ τὸν τῆς Πίστεως νεὼν προσπεπηγυίας ἀπέῤῥηξε καὶ διεσκέδασε.

and second, nor that in which the senate met in the Gracchan tumult. Cicero, in the first passage, says that the temples of Fides and Mens had been *lately* dedicated on the Capitoline Hill by M. Æmil. Scaurus; and in the second, that the temple was near that of Jupiter, Opt. Max., and was founded *by our ancestors*[1]; a phrase which he would hardly have used of Numa. Atilius Calatinus had nothing whatever to do with the matter. Mr Burn has confused the temple of Spes, *previously* founded by Calatinus, with those founded by Scaurus. On the other hand, Valerius Maximus, Plutarch, and Appian evidently speak of the temple originally founded by Numa. The manner in which Livy relates this is not very perspicuous. He mentions that Numa introduced a cultus of Fides, and proceeds to say that he ordered the *flamines* to proceed *to that temple*—though he had not previously mentioned any—in bigæ, and to perform sacrifice with the hand wrapped up as far as the fingers (Et soli Fidei solemne instituit: ad id sacrarium flamines bigis, curru arcuato, vehi jussit, manuque ad digitos usque involuta, rem divinam facere, I. 21). *Sacrarium* usually denotes a place where sacred utensils are deposited; in Lib. XXXIX. 9 and 10, Livy uses it of the place where the unholy rites of the Bacchanals were performed at Rome. But if the senate could be assembled in the Sacrarium of Fides, it must have been a temple; that is, it must have been an inaugurated place. But to return:—

Among the ancients these allegorical divinities, as well indeed as what we may call their more proper gods, had different attributes; thus as there was a Pudor patricia, and a plebeia, so also there seems to have been a Fides publica and a Fides privata. Now that Public Faith was the deity established by Numa we learn from Dionysius: *ἱερὸν ἱδρύσατο Πίστεως δημοσίας καὶ θυσίας αὐτῇ κατεστήσατο δημοτελεῖς* (II. 75). Wherefore in the passage of Valerius Maximus, in which he relates

[1] "Ut Fides ut Mens, quas in Capitolio dedicatas videmus proxime à M. Æmilio Scauro, ante autem ab Atilio Calatino erat Spes consecrata." De Nat. Deor. II. 23: "Qui jus igitur jurandum violat, is Fidem violat, quam in Capitolio vicinam Jovis Optimi Maximi—ut in Catonis oratione est—majores nostri esse voluerunt." De Off. III. 29.

the Gracchan sedition, we should probably read *publicæ* for *publice:* "in aedem Fidei publicæ convocati Patres Conscripti," &c. (III. 2. 17).

We learn from this passage only that the senate was assembled on that occasion in the temple of Public Faith, and there is nothing to show the site of it; though it is a probable inference from the passage we have quoted from Dio (supra p. 244) that it lay near the temple of Saturn. On the other hand the passage referred to in Appian affords the most satisfactory negative evidence that it could not possibly have been in the Capitol, and for the purpose in hand this is enough. For that historian relates that, on the critical day, Gracchus occupied the Comitium and the Capitoline temple with his partizans *κατέλαβε τοῦ Καπιτωλίου τὸν νεὼν ἔνθα χειροτονήσειν ἔμελλον καὶ τὰ μέσα τῆς ἐκκλησίας* (p. 612, ed. Tollii). In the midst of the confusion the senate assemble in the temple of Faith (*γιγνομένων δὲ τούτων ἡ βουλὴ συνῆλθεν εἰς τὸ τῆς Πίστεως ἱερόν,* p. 613); apparently because as the Gracchani had occupied the Comitium, they were debarred access to the Curia; and still less would they have been able to mount to the Capitol, already seized by the rioters, without a fight. Having passed some resolutions in the Temple of Faith, they *mounted up* to the Capitol under the conduct of the Pontifex Maximus, Corn. Scipio Nasica (*κρίναντες δ' ὅσα ἔκριναν, ἐς τὸ Καπιτώλιον ἀνήεσαν, ib.*). When Nasica *had ascended* to the temple (*ἀνελθὼν δὲ εἰς τὸ ἱερόν,* p. 614)—not therefore that which they had *left below,* as Becker seems most wonderfully to have construed, confounding this *ἱερόν* of the Capitol with the former one of Faith—his followers began to attack the Gracchani on the summit, driving them onwards and hurling them over the precipice; and in the tumult Gracchus himself was slain near the doors of the temple and the statues of the kings; which therefore stood, not before the Temple of Faith, but, as was much more natural, before the temple of Jove, the principal one on the Capitol (*καὶ Γράκχος αὐτὸς εἰλούμενος περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν, ἀνῃρέθη παρὰ τὰς θύρας, παρὰ τοὺς τῶν βασιλέων ἀνδρίαντας, ib.*). Indeed it is absurd to suppose that the Senate could have held a sitting in the temple of Fides, had it been

close to the Capitoline, while the Gracchani were in possession of the latter. Plutarch's account of the matter is another proof that the temple of Fides was below. He tells us that Flavius Flaccus, one of the senators, who seems to have been a friend of Gracchus, hastened to communicate the decision which the senate had come to to kill him, and called out from below, but could not be heard; on which he made signs that he wanted to speak privately with Tiberius. Gracchus ordered his people to make way for him; when Flaccus, *having ascended with some difficulty* (*ἀναβὰς μόλις*), acquainted Tiberius with the danger he was in (Tib. Gracch. c. 18).

Paterculus, in his brief account of the matter (II. 3), tells the story rather differently, and makes Nasica exclaim "qui salvam vellent rempublicam se sequerentur," after he had mounted up to the Capitol, and as the signal for the actual attack; and not, as Appian with more probability relates in the Temple of Faith, before ascending. But this is of no importance.

The necessity therefore for encumbering the Capitol with a temple large enough to hold the senate, arises only from a total misunderstanding, or wilful perversion of some not very difficult texts. The temples in the Capitol erected by Scaurus to Fides—apparently private Faith—and Mens, were doubtless comparatively small. With regard to the "templum ingens" of Jupiter Custos erected by Domitian (Tac. Hist. III. 74; Suet. Dom. 5), the evidence only goes to show that it stood somewhere on the Capitoline hill.

I have now examined Mr Burn's three decisive arguments against the temple's having been on the height of Ara Celi, and am at a loss to discover on what this supposed decisive character is founded. On the other hand, among the arguments, which he regards as undecisive, there are two or three, I think, which at all events are not so unimportant as he imagines.

Most of the descriptions of the attacks upon the Capitol I will at once abandon. I have indeed never used any of them, except that of the Vitellians, as showing anything of a positive character; although Becker did, and with his usual

overweening opinionativeness, adduced them as completely decisive of the question. My remarks in the article on Rome were made merely to show that this was not the case; and from the observations made by Mr Burn, p. 187 sq., I appear to have succeeded. On this point I hope I may also be permitted to adduce the opinion of the late Lord Broughton, a very competent judge of the matter. He says: "I confess that the learned and candid writer of the article 'Rome' in Dr Smith's Dictionary, seems to me to have demolished Becker's arguments in favour of the Caffarelli height (in which arguments are included the three advanced by Mr Burn as *decisive*), although perhaps he has not removed all the objections to the other summit. Indeed Mr Dyer, the writer of the article, with a fairness that does him honour, and adds weight to his opinions in general, confesses that the question will not admit of complete demonstration;" but he adds, "we hope that the balance of probability may be shown to predominate very considerably in favour of the north-east height[1]." And in a note on this passage Lord Broughton says: "The story of the famous Vitellian attack on the Capitol, as told by Tacitus, is completely perverted in order to make it suit the German theory; and Mr Dyer is fully entitled to exclaim, 'Our chief objection to this account is its impossibility.'" With regard to that attack I still hold the opinion that I expressed in my article, p. 765: "It is plain that the fire (which destroyed the temple) broke out near the Lucus Asyli, and then spreading from house to house, caught at last the *front* of the temple. This follows from Tacitus' account of the porticoes and the eagles which supported the *fastigium*, or pediment, first catching fire. The back-front of the Capitoline temple was plain, apparently a mere wall; since Dionysius (IV. 61) does not say a single word about it, though he particularly describes the front as having a triple row of columns, and the sides double rows. But as we know that the temple faced the south, such an accident could not have happened except it stood on the north-east height, or that of Ara Celi."

Mr Burn has not thought it worth while to notice this

[1] See Lord Broughton's *Italy*, Vol. II. p. 12.

argument, and it still remains unrefuted. He has also passed over my argument (p. 768 A), from Dionysius' description of the temple, that had it lain on the south-west height, it would have presented its nude and unadorned back to those who approached it. Nor has he adverted to an argument which, I believe, nobody but myself has advanced, drawn from Livy's narrative of the trial of Manlius (VI. 20). The Comitia Centuriata were assembled to judge Manlius at the spot afterwards occupied by the Circus Flaminius; whence, as a glance at the map will show, the north-east height must have been conspicuous, and the Arx also in sight. Manlius took advantage of the situation to appeal to these objects, and especially to the Capitol, with its temple of Jove, "Capitolium spectans Jovem deosque alios devocasse ad auxilium fortunarum suarum." Where it is evident that, by 'Capitolium,' Livy means not the whole hill, but the Capitol in its narrower sense: first, because he alludes to the temple of Jove upon it; secondly, because just afterwards he enumerates the two summits distinctly (ut Capitolium utque arcem intuentes). To deprive him of this appeal, the tribunes altered the place of assembly to the Lucus Poetelinus, a spot just outside the Porta Flumentana, whence the Capitol with its temple could not be seen (unde conspectum in Capitolium non esset). The map will show that this was the only spot in the Campus Martius where the temple, from its being hidden by the south-west summit, which we assume to have been the Arx, was concealed from view. The tribunes would doubtless have been glad to conceal the Arx also, had it been possible; but an appeal to that alone would have wanted the effect of the *religio* which so much swayed the superstitious Romans; for the temples even on that height could hardly have been visible, but only the towering edge of the precipice. They were no longer in the presence of those rescued deities in whose sight Manlius had invoked their judgment (see Dict. p. 751).

The auguraculum upon the Arx is another very awkward object for those who place the Arx at Ara Celi. Mr Burn (p. 195) allows that the argument drawn from it is not without weight, yet contends that there is not much reality in it. His

attempts to evade it are, however, of a very slippery description. "The Ara Celi height," he says, "is about fifteen feet higher than the Caffarelli, and as the temple of Jupiter upon the latter is known to have been a comparatively low structure, *perhaps* partly in order not to obstruct the view from the opposite height, and the auguraculum was *most likely* raised upon a tower, the augurs *may easily* have been able to see over the temple roof. Even if this be not admitted, is there any impossibility in *the supposition* that the Temple of Jupiter enjoyed an exemption from the rules applied to ordinary temples and houses[1]?"

No impossibility, perhaps, but the very highest degree of improbability. As the temple of Jupiter must have been inaugurated, it is very unlikely that the augurs would have violated their own rules in its construction; especially as they might so easily have avoided the difficulty by making a new auguraculum in front of the temple on the south-west summit. This however they did not do; the auguraculum continued to be on the Arx; and, therefore, the probable inference is, that the Arx was the south-west summit. Mr Burn's 'supposition' therefore I cannot admit, especially as we see that the augurs were so particular about getting an unobstructed view, that they ordered a house on the Cælian, a long way off, to be lowered. How much more must their prospect have been interfered with by a huge temple just before them! With regard to the augurs being able to see *over it*, it would have been desirable to have had a little more evidence about that high tower, which at present seems to have no more solid foundation than a castle in the air. A better way of evading the difficulty would have been to assert that the augur looked west, as Mr Burn does in his note (No. 5), after Becker (*Handb.* IV. s. 357); though in the text he says, and I think more correctly, that he looked generally towards the south.

But to quit these arguments from probability and advert to something more tangible. After the publication of my article, some excavations were undertaken on the Caffarelli

[1] The italics are of course my own, and are merely designed to call the reader's attention to the steps of the argumentative process.

height, with a view to discover if any traces still remained of the Capitoline temple supposed to have been seated there. The labour was not altogether fruitless; for the foundations of a very considerable temple, and from the nature of the building a very ancient one, were brought to light. It measured 39·18 metres in length, and about 24 in breadth, or about 127 feet by 79: and was therefore no unworthy sister to the Capitoline temple, whose length was only about 200 feet. But, as these dimensions clearly showed that it could not have been the Capitoline, the theory that the latter lay on the Caffarelli height was abandoned by the more candid of the German school, and M. von Reumont in his History of the City of Rome, recently published, admits that the result of the excavations is fatal to that assumption[1]. And accordingly in his plan at the end of the volume, he places the Templum Jovis on the north-east height and the Arx on the south-west.

Not so Mr Burn; who, *ipsis Germanis germanior*, still sticks to his theory, though these extensive remains impinge on the spot where the Capitoline should have lain, had it been on that height at all. "Whether the foundations thus described," he says (p. 188), "be those of Domitian's temple of Jupiter Custos, or must be ascribed to the more ancient temple of Fides, cannot at present be decided." But, at present, I think we are in a condition to say very decidedly that at least they could not have belonged to the last; that is, to the large temple of Fides founded by Numa, which Mr Burn supposes to have been on the Capitol. But the exclusion of this temple does not imply the acceptance of Mr Burn's alternative, that then it must have been the temple of Jupiter Custos. From the size and site of it, it is much more likely to have been that of Juno Moneta, which we know lay on the opposite height to that of her brother and husband. And as these remains extend from the Caffarelli palace to the Via di Monte

1 Die Ergebnisse der jüngsten Ausgrabungen im Garten des Palazzo Caffarelli scheinen die Annahme dass der Haupttempel auf der südwestlichen Höhe gelegen habe, auszuschliessen. Gesch. der Stadt Rom. B. i. Anmerk. s. 800. Berlin, 1867.

Caprino, there could have been no room eastwards for a temple of 200 feet, or about 60 metres; for the whole breadth of the height from that place is barely so much, and would have left no room for roads and approaches. And for this we need only refer the reader to Becker's plan of the Capitoline Hill in his *Handbuch*.

I will now take my leave of the Capitoline question. I am far from presuming to say that I have decided it; but I will re-assert, with greatly increased confidence, the conclusion at which I arrived some fifteen years ago, that on the whole the balance of probability inclines very considerably in favour of the north-east height. I am aware that I may be twitted with having departed in some of the remarks which I have made, and particularly with regard to the temple of Fides, from what I had previously said in my article on Rome in Dr Smith's Dictionary of Geography. But *αἱ δεύτεραι φροντίδες σοφώτεραι*. I am not ashamed to acknowledge that I have grown somewhat wiser, and perhaps the circumstances under which that article was written, may extenuate the commission of a few mistakes. Mr Bunbury having unexpectedly declined to write it, I was requested to undertake it. I had not previously given any special attention to the subject; the time allowed for the completion of the task did not embrace many months, and part of it was to be devoted to a visit to Rome. I was strongly recommended to follow Becker, then in high vogue; by doing so, I should certainly have saved myself a great deal of trouble, and perhaps have earned an equal modicum of reputation. But as I proceeded with my task, I found that I could not always implicitly trust Becker's "admirable work." I ventured to differ from him on three capital points of Roman topography; the sites of the Capitoline temple, of the Comitium, and of the Curia Julia, which last, indeed, is a natural sequence from the restoration of the Comitium to its proper place. On the last two Mr Burn has confirmed my judgment by adopting it; but, though I was the first, at all events in England, to bring forward new views on these points, Mr Burn has completely ignored me. Mommsen had adopted the same view as myself respecting the Comi-

tium; but it was not till my article was nearly ready for the press that I lighted on his. Detleftsen's paper on the same subject was posterior to mine. With regard to the Curia Julia, nobody, I believe, either at home or abroad had previously entertained my view of it. The establishment of these points, and the investigation of the other multitudinous questions respecting the topography of Rome, demanded a great share of my limited time; and I am afraid that in some subordinate arguments I may have placed too much confidence in Becker. It may be said that I had an opportunity to correct any oversights in a re-issue of my article in 1864, for the use of travellers, a purpose for which it was never intended. But that reprint was made without my consent, or even knowledge; and contains some original errors of the press uncorrected. On my remonstrance, the Publishers placed on the fly-leaf a notice that the book was a verbatim reprint of the article published in 1856, and therefore only represents the views held by the author at that time. I regret that the erroneous view respecting the temple of Fides has also slipped into my History of the City of Rome, p. 37, and I hereby recall it. It was not till I was writing my History of the Kings of Rome, that I became fully aware of the extent to which Becker could abuse and garble the passages of ancient authors in order to suit his views.

THOS. H. DYER.

Jan. 21, 1871.

ACTS XXI. 37, 38.

Ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Ἑλληνιστὶ γινώσκεις· οὐκ ἄρα σὺ εἶ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος, ὁ πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν κ.τ.λ.

Dr ALEXANDER ROBERTS in his "Discussions on the Gospels," deals with the question of the language employed by our Lord and his disciples in a manner, which, to my mind, is generally satisfactory. I fully go along with the general course of his argument, when he contends, that the Jews in general and the Galilæans in particular were to a great extent bilingual, using Greek and Aramaic indifferently, just as the Welsh in Britain and the Czechs in Bohemia, although circumstances would often arise, in which they would prefer to be addressed in their properly national language, as in Acts xxii. 2. But when he deals with the passage, which I propose to discuss, he has no better suggestions to make than that a "rude Egyptian" might possibly have been unable to speak Greek. Yet Egypt was undoubtedly the stronghold of Hellenism; the Septuagint was to all intents and purposes the Bible of the Egyptian Jews; the learned Philo himself appears to have been ignorant of Hebrew; and if an Egyptian Jew was ignorant of Greek, it is difficult to imagine what language he could have spoken for the common purposes of life and business.

I consider, that in this matter Dr Roberts, and also Dean Alford, have been misled by the authority of Winer, who objects to the rendering of *οὐκ ἄρα* by *nonne igitur?* which is adopted in English by the Authorised Version, and renders the words by *non igitur*, "Thou art not then (as I thought, but now see contradicted) that Egyptian." It is true, that *οὐκ ἄρα* is most frequently used as Winer says, but I shall presently prove by the only legitimate method, that of quotation from Greek authors of undoubted weight, that it is not exclusively

so used. My authorities will be Æschines and Sophocles, who have both been strangely overlooked by those who have discussed the passage in question.

In § 20 of the Oration of Æschines against Ctesiphon I find the following passage: *πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ τὴν βουλὴν τὴν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ ἐγγράφειν πρὸς τοὺς λογιστὰς ὁ νόμος κελεύει λόγον καὶ εὐθύνας διδόναι κ.τ.λ. Οὐκ ἄρα στεφανωθήσεται ἡ βουλὴ ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου; οὐδὲ γὰρ πάτριον αὐτοῖς ἐστιν. Οὐκ ἄρα φιλοτιμοῦνται; πάνυγε, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀγαπῶσιν, ἐάν τις παρ' αὐτοῖς μὴ ἀδικῇ, ἀλλ' ἐάν τις ἐξαμαρτάνῃ, κολάζουσιν.* "For firstly the law orders the council in Areopagus to give in an account in writing to the auditors and to submit to an audit.... Shall therefore the council of Areopagus not be crowned? No, for it is not an ancestral custom for them to be so. Are they therefore not actuated by patriotic feeling? Yes, very much so, nay, they are not contented, if any one in their number be free from actual guilt, but if any one be in error, they punish him." It certainly appears to me unquestionable, that an interrogation is put in an excited manner by *οὐκ ἄρα* in the above, just as it is by *ἄρα* alone in § 182 of the same oration: *ἀχάριστος ἄρ' ἦν ὁ δῆμος; οὐκ, ἀλλὰ μεγαλόφρων,* "Was therefore the people ungrateful? No, but magnanimous." It is worthy of notice also, that of the two questions asked above by *οὐκ ἄρα*, the first is met by a negative and the second by an affirmative answer.

Again in Sophocles, Ajax, 1238, we find:

οὐκ ἆρ' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄνδρες εἰσι πλὴν ὅδε;

"Have the Greeks then no men save Ajax?"

In this passage there was nothing to prevent Sophocles from writing *ἆρ' οὐκ* instead of *οὐκ ἆρα*, if the same meaning would have been conveyed by the words in an inverse order.

I think I have now brought forward enough to uphold the rendering of the Authorised Version, although I am not satisfied with the note of interrogation after *Ἑλληνιστὶ γινώσκεις*. I translate with considerable confidence: "And he said: Thou knowest Greek; art thou not then the Egyptian, &c.?"

An Egyptian Jew would be likely to speak Greek better

than a Galilæan, and the goodness of St Paul's language and pronunciation would naturally suggest to Claudius Lysias the hypothesis of his being an Egyptian Jew of influence.

Rom. iii. 30.

Ἐπείπερ εἷς ὁ θεὸς, ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως.

Singular difficulties meet us in this passage as ordinarily construed, which appear to become less explicable the more they are examined. Why should the preposition *ἐκ* be applied to the justification of the circumcised Jew, while the preposition *διὰ* is applied to that of the uncircumcised Gentile? Why should the article be inserted between the preposition and its noun in the case of the Gentile, while it is omitted in that of the Jew? Answers exhibiting more or less acuteness and power of hair-splitting have been given by various commentators to these questions, but the general result of their arguments has been an increasing conviction in my own mind, that the Apostle Paul had no such views, and entered into no such subtletics, as they are severally compelled to ascribe to him.

Can we not then begin *de novo*, and find an explanation of the words, which shall simply put aside and ignore the antitheses in question and the whole set of controversies founded upon them? Can we not find an explanation, which shall entirely get rid of the assumed antithesis between *ἐκ πίστεως* and *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*?

If we return to verse 26 in the same chapter, we find the expression *τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ*, which appears to bear a singular relation to, and perhaps may have suggested *περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως*, as a compound expression in the passage which we are considering. It is pretty clear that in verse 25, *ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως* is a compound expression; why should not *περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως* be one of a similar character?

We thus obtain two classes, that God is willing to justify, *περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως*, "circumcision, that is of faith," i.e. Jews

who accept the law of faith and covenant of grace instead of those of works, and *ἀκροβυστίαν*, "uncircumcision," i.e. Gentiles, the justification of each class being produced in the same way, viz. *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*, "through their faith." No question as to the justification of Gentile converts having arisen, the words *ἐκ πίστεως* may be fairly considered as implied in their case, while they are an absolutely necessary adjunct to *περιτομὴ* in the connection.

Again, the whole stress of the subsequent argument lies on *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*, which is repeated in various forms, *ἐκ πίστεως*, *διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως κ.τ.λ.*; and this argument certainly loses force, if *ἐκ πίστεως* be opposed in the case of the Jew, who might fear the *κατάργησις* of the law, to *διὰ τῆς πίστεως* in the case of the Gentile, who had never had any thing to do with the law.

Again, the phrase *ἐκ πίστεως* is subsequently also used as equivalent to an adjective in the expression *τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραὰμ* in iv. 16. So too *ἐκ νόμου* is used as an adjective in the expression *οἱ ἐκ νόμου* in iv. 14; and similar instances might be quoted ad infinitum. Without the article we have *κληρόνομοι κατ' ἐλπίδα*, "heirs expectant" in Tit. iii. 7, and *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* is frequently used as a substantive.

No ambiguity could have arisen, had St Paul written *περιτομὴν τὴν ἐκ πίστεως* in the passage under consideration, but then the article would have given a definiteness to his language, which he was not improbably anxious to avoid.

The whole passage if paraphrased so as to exhibit the argument as clearly as possible, would perhaps run as follows, beginning at verse 27: "Where then is vaunting? It has been excluded. Through what law? That of works? No, but through the law of faith. For we reckon, that a man is justified by faith independently of the works of the law. Or is God a God of Jews only? Is he not also God of Gentiles? Yes, of Gentiles also, since one and the same is the God, who will justify (1) circumcised Jews, who believe, and (2) uncircumcised Gentiles, in each case by means of their faith. Are we then destroying or putting an end to the law by means of the faith, which we are preaching up? Never! On the

contrary, we are establishing the law on a firm basis, as a law of faith and not of works, a law of Spirit and not of letter."

Titus iii. 8 and 14.

In these two passages we have the expression *καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι*, which is translated in the text of the Authorized Version "to maintain good works," and in the margin "to profess honest trades." The commentators generally favour the rendering of the text, and indeed I am not acquainted with one who takes his stand upon that of the margin.

Let us consider the context of the passages in which this expression occurs. In Tit. iii. 8, translating literally, we have: "Trusty is the saying, and about these things I wish thee to be positive, that those who have believed God may be heedful *καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι*; these are *καλὰ* and beneficial to mankind." What are *καλὰ* and beneficial to mankind? Surely the *ἔργα* in question. But *all* "good works" in the ordinary sense of the word are such, and if *καλὰ ἔργα* are to be considered as merely equivalent to *ἀγαθὰ ἔργα*, a sense of *καλὸς* not unfrequent in late Greek, the clause *ταῦτά ἐστι καλὰ κ.τ.λ.* is a mere piece of useless tautology. The context therefore appears to drive us to the rendering of the margin, which makes the clause *ταῦτά ἐστι καλὰ κ.τ.λ.*, an excellent explanation of the meaning of *καλῶν* in *καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι*.

Let us now proceed to ver 14. Here we find *μανθανέτωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρείας*. Here it surely is much more natural to consider the article *τὰς* as having a subjective meaning, and referring to the subject of the sentence in the sense: "for their [own] necessary requirements," than to understand "the necessary requirements *of the individuals in the community*" to be implied. Or we may understand the article as generalizing the words to which it is prefixed, so that *εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρείας* would signify "for necessary requirements in general," "for *all* neces-

sary requirements;" which would imply a direction to Christians living amongst heathens to confine themselves to reputable and necessary employments, avoiding such as were unnecessary, and the mere handmaids of luxury.

As to the word *ἔργον*, I need but quote 1 Tim. iii. 1, *εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ*: "If any one is anxious for a bishop's office, he desires an honourable occupation;" and Xenophon, de Vect. IV. 6: *ἀργυρῖτις δὲ ὅσῳ ἂν πλείων φαίνηται, τοσούτῳ πλείονες ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο ἔρχονται*: "The more silver-ore appears, the more persons come to this occupation."

With regard to *προΐστασθαι*, it will be requisite to examine at first hand, rather than accept at second hand the traditional references of Lexicons and commentators. In the Electra of Sophocles, 980, we have:

> *ὦ τοῖσιν ἐχθροῖς εὖ βεβηκόσιν ποτε*
> *ψυχῆς ἀφειδήσαντε προὐστήτην φόνου.*

Here *προυστῆναι φόνου* is clearly used in the sense of "inflicting death upon" enemies in prosperity. In Xen. Mem. III. 2. 2, we find: *εἰ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ βίου καλῶς προεστήκοι*, "if he regulated his own life well." These passages are as favourable to the view against which, as to that for which, I am contending. But I can scarcely believe that a passage in Athenæus, 612 A, has often been actually referred to by commentators, who favour the rendering of the text of the Authorized Version. We find here that the art of a perfume manufacturer was not always considered reputable, *Σόλωνος τοῦ νομοθέτου οὐδ' ἐπιτρέποντος ἀνδρὶ τοιαύτης προΐστασθαι τέχνης*, "Solon, the lawgiver, not even permitting a man to *profess*, or rather *practise*, such an art."

Here we have at once an illustration of both the words and the sense of the passages in question. Can we hesitate for an instant between taking the injunctions of St Paul as trite maxims of the driest kind, and understanding them as vivid practical precepts, bearing closely on the social relations of his day?

A. H. WRATISLAW.

ON LUCRETIUS, BOOK VI.

As most of the suggestions on the 6th book of Lucretius made by me in this Journal (1869, pp. 219—228) have been recently impugned by Prof. Munro (Journ. 1870, pp. 115—217), I wish to say something more on the points in discussion between us.

47—49. Most editors will probably accept, as Prof. Munro has done, Bernays' view that there is a lacuna after v. 47. The two next vv. are in the MSS. as follows:

Ventorum exirtant placentur omnia rursum
Que fuerint sint placato conuersa fauore.

I proposed to read

Ventorum existant, placentur momina rursum,
Quae fuerint sint placato conuersa furore.

Existant is a conjecture of Bernays', and seems to me nearly certain; *furore* is as old as the second edition of Lambinus: *momina* is mine. Prof. Munro objects that *momen* is elsewhere only used in the singular. I would not deny that Scaliger has failed to prove the existence of *momina* in Manil. III. 679, IV. 207: but if Lucr. could use so unusual a plural as *aeribus*, IV. 291, V. 645, he might, I think, with less license use *momina*, a plural which has nothing objectionable in its form, and if it occurred in even one undoubted passage of Lucretius would be accepted without hesitation. And this reading does *not* necessitate another lacuna, though a double lacuna is possible. Like *existant* and *placentur*, *sint* may be dependent on some word in the lines which have dropped out: 'whilst I explain how the agitations of the winds arise, and are then again lulled; how those which have been, lull their rage

to rest and are now changed to calm.' The second line is not mere tautology; it passes from the general to the particular; or rather from a general rule to a number of imagined particulars, as if he should say, 'what rule determines the rise and fall of winds; how it is that what a moment ago was violent agitation is now profound calm.'

53. If *homines* may be the subject of *faciunt animos humiles*, it may surely be also of *depressosque premunt. Demittere, deicere animum* of men losing heart is common enough both in prose and verse: and if Lucr. could say *premunt animos*, he might say *depressos premunt animos*. There is the same continued subject in Cat. XVII. 24—26. *Si pote stolidum repente excitare ueternum Et supinum animum in graui derelinquere coeno Ferream ut soleam tenaci in uoragine mula.*

65. I allow that my interpretation of these lines is bold, but that was the very reason why I put it forward: the same may be said of my view of 715 and 729—731. Since I wrote my first article, I have made a wider study of Lucret., and am more decidedly of opinion than before that he at times emancipates himself from the, in his age, gradually increasing strictness of Latin construction; at times availing himself of what is quite as conspicuous in Roman idiom, a native brevity or involution of construction which only becomes grammatical when explained on some broad principle. To give some instances before returning to v. 68, I think that as in IV. 831 *ut facere ad uitam possemus quae foret usus, quae* does not depend on *facere* understood, but the nom. or accus. must be explained out of the general use of *usus est*, so in IV. 779, 780, *Quaeritur in primis quare quod cuique libido Venerit extemplo mens cogitet eius id ipsum, quod* does not depend upon *cogitare* supplied from *cogitet*, but on *libido venerit* alone, whether *libido venerit* simply = an expanded *libuerit* or actually contains enough of a verbal notion in itself to make *quod* an accus.

Again II. 1037:

> *Nil ut opinor; ita haec species miranda fuisset.*
> *Quam tibi iam nemo, fessus satiate uidendi,*
> *Suspicere in coeli dignatur lucida templa;*

where Munro translates *quam* 'how', I venture to think that it is the relative dependent on *suspicere*, that *in caeli templa* is appended to this as epexegetic, and that there are thus, so to speak, two clauses dependent on *dignatur*, (1) *quam nemo dignatur suspicere*, (2) *nemo dignatur suspicere in caeli templa*, 'an appearance which no one any longer cares to look up to—to look up, I say, into the quarters of the sky.' It is of course obvious that *suspicere may* be 'look up to see,' and there are many to whom this explanation would seem sufficient; but it is worth while to put forward the bolder hypothesis, because it would be difficult to name any one in whom a freer spirit breathed than Lucretius, and this is not unlikely to have found something to correspond to it in the idiosyncrasies of his expression.

More doubtful is IV. 397—399, *Exstantisque procul medio de gurgite montis Classibus inter quos liber patet exitus ingens Insula coniunctis tamen ex his una uidetur.* Munro makes *montis* an accus. by attraction: I hold it to be a nominative; the original outline of the sentence was *montis...coniuncti insula uidentur:* and if it had consisted of two verses only, this outline would probably have been retained as it is, the intervention of the defining relative clause, *Classibus inter quos*, enables him to give a freer, if I must say so, a more Greek form to the sentence; the nomin. of the first verse is repeated in a different shape—not *hi coniuncti*, but *ex his coniunctis*.

To return to VI. 68: I did not deny any one of Prof. Munro's statements, but was not convinced by them, nor am I now. The whole point of my remarks was to shew that they did not settle the question. Resolve *quae nisi* into *quod nisi haec*, as Prof. Munro does; that does not diminish the difficulty of separating *dis indigna putare* from them; and if they cannot be separated without harshness, we are reduced to my explanation. There are however other things of a similar kind. Take IV. 1088, *Quod fieri contra totum natura repugnat*, 'the direct contrary of which nature protests to be the case' (Munro), more literally, 'which nature combats to be all done contrary.' What does nature combat? not that it is done contrary, but that it is done at all; it *asserts* that it is done contrary. But that asser-

tion is a denial of the other theory; and *repugnat* conveys both ideas; it 'fights away' from the first theory, and asserts, equally combatively, the contrary. Take again IV. 500, *Et si non poterit ratio dissoluere causam Cur ea quae fuerint iuxtim quadrata, procul sint Visa rotunda, tamen praestat rationis egentem Reddere mendose causas utriusque figurae.* You try to *explain* the reason why square seems round, not to *explain away* (*dissoluere*). What then do you explain away? The *fact* that square seems round. But as both notions, the negative of explaining away a fact, the positive of explaining the reason of that fact, are only the obverse and reverse of one medal, the μὲν and δὲ of one notion, Lucr. combines them in *dissoluere*, and makes a sentence which is *prima facie* illogical, however easy it may be to overlook the difficulty, by the use of some *vox media* like 'protest.' This is true of *parcit in hostes*, whether translated 'spares it for his enemies' (Munro), or, as I should prefer, 'reserves it to attack his enemies;' either version conceals the change which it has undergone, from its natural meaning of 'withholds it against his enemies,' i.e. withdraws it so as *not* to attack them, to an unnatural one of 'reserves it, so as to attack.'

116. To the passages quoted by me in defence of the MSS. reading, may, I think, be added IV. 668, *Fit prius ad sensum quae corpora conueniebant Nunc non conueniant et cetera sint magis apta.* Lachm. alters *Fit* to *ut*; Prof Munro inserts *ut* before *quae*, and says that for years he has considered the omission of *ut* in such cases impossible. Allowing all weight to his authority, and it would be difficult to name any greater, I cannot help rejoicing in the admission of his former doubts; doubts which are not quite extinct still, as his critical note on II. 1004 shews. There the MSS. read *Inde aliis aliud coniungit et efficit omnes Res ita conuertant formas*, which Lachm. alters to *coniungitur et fit ut omnes*, Munro to *coniungit et effit ut omnes*, with these words: 'no editor before Wak. would tolerate the omission of *ut:* yet it is a strange thing that our MSS. so often omit *ut* after *efficere* and *fieri*, if the omission is not the poet's own.'

129. Lachm. says that Lucr. is here speaking of the rend-

ing of the cloud which makes the noise; and that it is not till seven lines later that he speaks of the emission of the wind: hence *missa* cannot be right in the first passage; and must be changed to *fissa*. To me the difference of the two passages appears to lie in the gradual manner in which the wind works its way through the cloud in the first; the suddenness and directness of its impetus in the second. The storm in the first case takes some time to get under weigh, but when it has, it is launched (*missa*) with a loud explosion; hence the comparison; in the second nothing is *said* of an explosion; the wind is simply described as clearing a direct passage for itself through the cloud, *ualidi uis incita uenti* Perscindat *nubem*, perfringens *inpete recto*, where the undoubted occurrence of *perscindere* makes either *scissa* or *fissa* less probable in 129.

I pass to the consideration of *minent, cellens*. As to *minent* it is the MSS. reading in 563, and is certainly not put out of the field by *tument*, however convincing *tumebat* may seem in 1195 *frons tenta mebat*. *Cellens* for the MSS. *tellens* in 237, I preferred to *pellens*, as sounding like a rare, but in Lucr.'s time still possibly existing, form. No one could say as much for *cumbens;* but a very near parallel is supplied by *fligere* v. 1001, and still more by *stingui*, II. 828, I. 666, IV. 1098, a word also used by Cicero in his translation of Aratus; but in itself not felicitous, and which accordingly disappeared from use. Arguing however on general grounds, I do not think there is any author where one more naturally looks for rare forms than Lucretius. Prof. Munro on I. 653 enumerates *uariantia aegror maximitas pestilitas dispositura differitas refutatus emissus commutatus opinatus formatura*, to which may be added *formamentum frustramen loquacula silena exesor;* among verbs *dementit sentiscant adopinamur interdatus conrident;* the adj. *inolens*, and the adverbs *contractabiliter praemetuenter fluenter*, all peculiar to Lucr. Nor can it be said of any other writer of that age that he allowed himself an equal license in taking words to pieces; *facit are, ordia prima, inter quae cumque pretantur*, &c. &c., were really as bold, if not bolder than any merely rare word such as *minent*, or even, I think, *cellens*.

154. If *magis* belongs to the whole sentence, it cannot be

right to translate it as if it belonged to *terribili*, which is only the more emphatic part of the sentence. I should prefer 'there is nothing which surpasses the bay in burning,' &c.

258. I maintained that *et fertus* (*et fertur* is a misprint) was supported by so large a number of similar instances of *t* before *f* and *q*, as to make it probable that a *t*, not a *c*, was the dominant spelling and pronunciation: and I proposed therefore to read not *effertus* but *etfertus*, and so *etfututa*, *etquidnam*, *etquonam*, &c. Prof. Munro denies that *ex* ever passed into *et*, and considers that where *et* is found, the MSS. are either in error, or too late to be of much authority. It is therefore well to be explicit. In Virgil, Ecl. x. 28, *Etquis* is the first-hand reading of *P* (ascribed to the 4th or 5th century), the actual reading of *R* (believed to be not later than the 4th) as well as of Ribbeck's *γabc* (ninth or tenth century); Aen. III. 341, *Etqua* is found in the Medicean, and in *γac*, *Et qua* in *b*; 342, *Etquid* in *γbc*, *Et quid* in *a*: Aen. IX. 51, *Et quis* in *Pbc*, *Et quis* in *al*, *ec* in *γ*. G. IV. 450, *Etfatus* Med. Aen. III. 463, *etfatus* *γ*, first-hand. In Hor. S. II. 7. 34, *et quis* is found in Keller and Holder's *E* (11th century), *β* (11th) and *g* (15th). In Plautus, Aul. Prol. 16, Wagner's two primary MSS. have *etqui*; Pers. II. 2. 42, *etquid*, Ritschl's BCDF; Bacch. II. 3. 1, *et quae* C; I. 2. 51, *et quid* C; Mil. Glor. III. 1. 187, *Et quam* BCD; IV. 3. 13, *et quid* B, and Nonius, p. 306; IV. 3, 18 *et qui* C; IV. 7, 14, *et quis*. *Et quid* Ter. And. V. 2. 30, Umpfenbach's DEG, Eun. II. 2. 48 E, *et quod* Eun. III. 3. 13 A (the Bembine, probably not later than the 5th century), besides CEFG; and in three consecutive lines, Eun. III. 3. 15—17, *et qua* AE, *et quis* AE, *et quis* AE; Hec. V. 3. 6, *et quem* A; *et quid* Prol. And. 25, BCDGP; and *et fatus*, *et quis* are found often in Nonius.

These cases are too constant to admit of being explained as mere mistakes; they point to something in the pronunciation, which occasioned the change from *c* or *cs* before *f* and *q* to *t*. Probably the *c* or *cs* was too full a sound, and was slurred into *t* in the haste of speaking; of the connexion phonetically of *c* and *t*, *bractea*, *brattea*; *mactea*, *mattea*; *Actius*, *Attius*; *sectius*, *setius*; *auctumnus*, *autumnus*, all good forms, in spite of Lachm. on Lucr. IV. 727, may be adduced as evidences. The same

thing is of course true of *prouincia, prouintia;* the pronunciation so far approximated, that both forms existed side by side, though one, as having more authority, is preferable, and I am quite ready to give way to Prof. Munro's infinitely greater experience in favour of *prouincia.*

285. Prof. Munro's change of *uideantur* to *uideatur* is a very slight one, and is no doubt supported by many similar examples in Lucr. and elsewhere; still the change is not necessary, and if not, *lumina* is the nearest subject, though possibly it is the combination of causes, wind and fire, which together forms the nom. to *uideantur.*

475. Whether *omnis ratio* = 'the whole principle' or 'every principle,' as in *omnis diuum natura,* 'every divine nature,' II. 646, the meaning of the line seems to me substantially as I translated, 'in every case.' *Omnibus* would probably have been the prose construction; but *omnis* is, if I am not greatly mistaken, equally good Latin.

483. I should rather have said that *illi* was *aestui* than *halitui;* but I still think *illa* weak, and *illi* intelligible.

490. *Tam magni montis tempestas atque tenebrae Coperiant maria ac terras,* 'if such huge mountains are the storm and darkness which cover earth and sea,' *i.e.* 'if in such huge mountain-masses gather the storm and darkness which cover the sea;' a construction no doubt more common in Greek than Latin, but confirmed, I think, by another passage, IV. 140, *Interdum magni montes auulsaque saxa Montibus antire et solem succedere praeter Inde alios trahere atque inducere belua nimbos,* where the mountain-like masses of cloud are described equally personally. The constr. is quite the same of Aen. IX. 132, *Tot milia gentes Arma ferunt Italae,* 'so many thousands are the Italian tribes that advance in arms.'

548—551. It is surely premature to say that *mihi cumque salue Rite uocanti* is the only one instance where *cumque* stands independently of a relative or relative adverb: there are many good writers whose text has not been critically edited; who can say to what extent this may operate in modifying our present rules, or how many as yet undiscovered instances of exceptions may increase the probability of exceptions known

already, but set aside as mistakes for want of further confirmation? In the case of *cumque*, Prof. Munro himself admits that the text of Lucr. presents many difficulties: for on II. 113, *Contemplator item cum solis lumina cumque Inserti fundunt radii per opaca domorum*, he says, 'I know no other example of *cumque* following *cum*;' in II. 21, *pauca uidemus Esse opus omnino quae demant cumque dolorem Delicias quoque uti multas substernere possint*, he accepts the MSS. reading doubtfully; in II. 720—722, *Nam ueluti tota natura dissimiles sunt Inter se genitae res quaeque, ita cumque necessest Dissimili constare figura principiorum*, he admits without comment the alteration *quamque*. More definite is Hand (Tursellinus s. u. *cumque*). He assigns to it two uses; one with relatives; the other, a more antique use, in which it stands alone, with the meaning of (*a*) *quandoque, quoquo tempore,* (*b*) *quoquo modo*, nearly = *in uniuersum*. This second use he finds in Lucr. II. 20, II. 113, as well as in VI. 85, III. 548, IV. 737, VI. 1017, and the certainly corrupt passage V. 312. I agree with his general view, but not in all his instances; it cannot, I think, be denied that in II. 113, VI. 85, 738, IV. 737, *cumque* more naturally qualifies the verb than any other word in the sentence. It *may* be so in II. 21; it is not impossible in II. 721, or, consequently, in VI. 550. With regard to V. 312 where the MSS. give *Quaerere proporro sibi cumque senescere credas*, I propose *silicumque senescere petras*, accepting Munro's *Aeraque* for *Quaerere*. I did not mention Lachmann's arguments against *plaustri*, because I thought them inconclusive; his words are '*immo* plaustri *non magno pondere concussa, id est leui plaustro. Editores quomodo* tecta non magno pondere *patienter ferre potuerint non uideo*.' But *plaustri* is separated by the length of a line from *non magno pondere*, and these words are in obvious antithesis to *tota; plaustri* in fact destroys the balance of the sentence, takes away from the strength of its ending, and is, as I said, less Lucretian than the abl. *plaustris*, followed by its second explaining abl. *non magno pondere*.

568. The difficulty of *respirare* appears to lie in this; in its more literal sense, it means to take breath *after holding the breath*, as divers do when they come up to the top of the water.

Cic. de Fin. IV. 23, 64: *Quis enim ignorat si plures ex alto emergere uelint propius fore eos quidem ad respirandum, qui ad summam aquam iam appropinquent, sed nihilo magis respirare posse quam eos qui sint in profundo?* And so Cicero talks of the wind-pipe breathing back and returning the air in the lungs, de Nat. Deor. II. 54, 136. In this sense 'to breathe back again or up,' implying that the air has till then been kept in the lungs, is intelligible enough; and as this respiration or taking breath is a relief to the breather, *respirare* easily passes into the meaning of resting. But how can this be true of the winds? They blow or breathe out, and then cease to blow; but this ceasing is not strictly a respiration; they could hardly be said *spirare, respirare,* to blow and abate blowing; if they respire or take breath, it cannot be by exhaling, which is their normal condition, but by simple quiescence. But then *respirare* would mean two different things, (1) to breathe back, either in the ordinary process of respiration, or after a stoppage of the breathing, (2) to rest after breathing. This is what I denied; the passages quoted by Prof. Munro are metaphorical, and *respirare* in them is in its second stage of meaning; whereas in Lucr. it must, one would think, be in its first. And if so, my view that it contains both ideas, 'to blow and lull,' may be right.

573. It cannot be considered certain that *pondere* is the real reading of MSS.: *pondera* is found in *B,* and has therefore almost equal authority. Prof. Munro's examples no doubt show that *pondere* is used much in the same way as *pondera,* but he has not shown that *recipit sedes in pondere* is *as* natural as *in pondera;* and until some more clear instance can be brought, prefer to follow my instinct in favour of the accus. '*Recipit sedes in pondere* is a proper expression, not *prolapsa in pondera;*' but need it be *prolapsa in pondera* at all? I took and still take *in pondera* with *recipit.*

624. The repetition of *uenti* is made much more probable by the recurrence of the line in v. 388, *Nequiquam, quoniam uerrentes aequora uenti,* and again v. 266.

715, 716. The whole point of my remarks on these verses was to raise the question of construction. In reading the two

lines together, *Aut quia sunt aestate aquilones ostia contra Anni tempore eo qui Etesiae esse feruntur*, it appeared to me that *Anni tempore eo* connected itself closely with the former line, and if so, *qui Etesiae e. f.* required explanation. Looking a little lower, I found a verse which presented a remarkable similarity, *Tempore eo fiant, quo etesia flabra aquilonum*—in two respects, the hiatus, and in the hiatus taking place in a relative (*qui, quo*), preceded by *tempore eo*. My explanation was no doubt tentative, perhaps wrong; but it is quite in accordance with the statements of ancient writers, who, while on the one hand they sometimes speak of the Etesian winds as the name of the north wind at a particular time of the year (Plin. H. N. II. 47), on the other sometimes speak as if that particular time of the year was called the time of the Etesian winds. A. Gell. II. 22. 25: *Etesiae et Prodromi appellitantur qui certo tempore anni cum Canis oritur ex alia atque alia parte caeli spirant.* Apulcius de Mundo, XIV.: *Sunt Etesiae et Prodromi spirantes ex omni parte eo tempore aestatis quod de Cane oritur.* A greater difficulty, I think, lies in 731, 732, for that *quo* should be followed by *tunc* is unquestionably harsh, and Lachmann rejects it for that reason; yet even this has some support from passages like IV. 518: *Iam ruere ut quaedam uideantur uelle ruantque Prodita iudiciis fallacibus omnia primis*, where *omnia* 'et haec, et illa' (Munro), 'all alike,' is added appositively, much in the same way as *tunc omnia* in 732. I observe that in VI. 740, *Principio quod Auerna uocantur nomine, id ab re Impositum est*, Prof. Munro reads *quo*. If Prof. Munro has no doubt that *quo* is wrong in 731, I have no doubt that *quod* is right in 740.

743. The mere fact that *remigium alarum* is found in Virgil, *remigium uolucrum pennas* in Ovid, is not sufficient to show that Lucr. uses the expression in the same way. The comparison of a bird's wings in flight to the oars of a vessel is natural, and very frequent both in Greek and Latin poetry. But Lucr. is prosaic even in his poetry; his matter-of-fact minuteness always bears the mark not merely of close observation, but of observation which takes in details and combines them, if possible, in representation, giving, as it were, side by

side, the successive stages of a picture. Here the birds, on reaching the pestilential lake, are seized with a dizziness, which makes them forget the even motion of wing which hitherto has borne them along as smoothly and quickly as a sailing ship; their pinions move convulsively and with pain; the motion is no longer placid, but broken, with a perceptible alternation, like the toiling of a rower. This too does not last long, the same dizziness which first changed their flight from smoothness to unevenness, from sailing to rowing, gradually paralyzes them altogether; their neck droops and they fall. So in Ovid's description of the fall of Icarus, Met. v. 227: *Tabuerant cerae; nudos quatit ille lacertos; Remigioque carens non ullas percipit auras. Oraque caerulea patrium clamantia nomen Excipiuntur aqua;* it is not till the wax wings have melted, that the oar-like motion is mentioned or thought of; it becomes conscious as soon as it begins to be difficult; and the next step is the fall into the sea. Cf. A. A. II. 89, 90: *Tabuerant cerae, nudos quatit ille lacertos, Et trepidat, nec quo sustineatur, habet. Occidit.* That the motion of rowing is one of struggling effort is shown by many passages where it is used equally metaphorically; *e.g.* in *πτερύγων ἐρετμοῖσιν ἐρεσσόμενοι* of the eagles circling wildly round their eyrie; Eur. I. T. 289 *ἡ δ' ἐκ χιτώνων πῦρ πνέουσα καὶ φόνον Πτεροῖς ἐρέσσει* of a Fury hovering fiercely in the air; Aesch. Supp. 541, *Ἰὼ οἴστρῳ ἐρεσσομένα.*

799. The passages where *flustra* is mentioned are (1) Paul. Diac. *Flustra dicuntur cum in mari fluctus non mouentur, quam Graeci μαλακίαν uocant.* (2) Isidorus de Natura Rerum, XLIV. (Sueton. Pratum de Naturis Rerum, 157 Reyfferscheid), *Flustrum motus maris sine tempestate fluctuantis uelut Naeuius in bello Punico sic ait.* Onerariae onustae stabant in flustris: *ut si diceret in salo.* (3) Tertull. de Pallio II. *Sic et mari fides infamis, dum et flabris aeque mutantibus, de tranquillo probum, de flustris temperatum, et extemplo de decumanis inquietat.* 'Similarly the sea has a bad character for being trusted, for, while the gusts upon it change as often as itself, it passes from a calm sea to a sea good for sailing, from heaving water to subsidence, and immediately after that from immense waves to

violent agitation.' (4) Placidi Gloss. *In flustris in porta* (*portu, Vahlen*). From these passages, *flustra* seems to mean the ordinary state of the sea, neither absolutely becalmed, nor very rough; with some agitation still perceptible. That such seas produce a feeling of nausea I know from personal observation; if that nausea is disregarded to the extent of taking a hearty meal followed by a hot bath—a combination notoriously unhealthy—it would easily produce a fainting fit, or, at least a staggering, which would be the next stage to it. Celsus gives many directions, which imply that great care had to be taken in the use of hot baths. II. 17: *Fere tamen...moto sudore leuiter corpus perungendum; deinde in aquam calidam demittendum est. Atque hic quoque habenda uirium ratio est neque committendum ut per aestum anima deficiat.*

804. It will not be denied that from Virgil's joining *Fermento* with *acidis sorbis, i. e.* apparently beer with a sort of cider, the smell from the latter might be a pretty strong one. Plin. H. N. XIV. 103, classes it with other *vina* made from fruits, *e cornis mespilis sorbis moris siccis,* and Palladius (Ian. XV. 5), *Item ex sorbis maturis sicut ex piris uinum fieri traditur et acetum.* Independently of this, service-berries were sometimes preserved in must, Cato R. R. VII. Palladius, u. s. But Lucretius would seem to refer, if my conjecture is right, to the wine or cider made from the berries. How then could he speak of such a decoction as *feruida sorbus?* There are more answers than one to this question. (1) It is possible that the berries were allowed to remain on the branch, and then steeped in liquid whole, in order to give a fuller flavour. One kind of myrtle wine was made in this way, Plin. H. N. XIV. 104. (2) Lucretius may be using the same sort of language as Cato, R. R. CXXV. *Vinum murteum sic facito. Murtam nigram arfacito in umbra. ubi iam passa erit, seruato ad uindemiam; in urnam musti contundito murtae semodium, id oblinito. Vbi desiuerit feruere mustum, murtam eximito,* which Pliny understood of myrtle-berries, either on the plant or alone, XV. 123, *Cato docuit uinum fieri e nigra siccata usque ad ariditatem in umbra atque ita musto indita: si non siccentur bacae, oleum gigni.* If Cato uses *murta* indefinitely, as we might say 'some myrtle,' implying berries, but not excluding

leaves or stem (it can hardly be a piece of myrtle wood, as he talks of cutting up a piece of juniper wood and boiling it in wine, c. CXXIII.), I think Lucretius might say *feruida sorbus* without presenting to his reader's imagination anything so definite as a boiling service-tree. *Sorbum*, a service-berry is as definite a word as can well be; yet Palladius, II. 15, 4, talks of grafting *sorba* upon sorb- or other trees, where Pliny more correctly speaks of *sorbi*, XVII. 75. So *cerasus* is strictly a cherry-tree, *cerasum* the fruit; yet Propertius says, *Hic dulces cerasos, hic auctumnalia pruna; pirus* a pear-tree, *pirum* a pear: yet Columella says, *piros serito* (de Arbor. XXIV.), and immediately after, *Mala aestiua cydonea sorba pruna serito:* cf. *amygdala si parum feracia erunt, perforata arbore lapidem adigito* (ib.), all tending to show that there was a freer use existing side by side with the more strict.

954. Prof. Munro speaks as if the passage quoted by him and Lachm. from Varro, L. L. V. 116, settled the question. Müller's best MSS. give it as follows. *Lorica quod e loris de corio crudo pectoralia faciebant: postea subcidit Galliae ferro sub id uocabulum ex anulis ferream tunicam.* Lachm. changes *Galliae* to *Galli e, ferream tunicam* to *fere iam tunica*, and translates 'afterwards that of the Gaul (= the Gaulish breastplate) of iron came to be included under that word,' and Munro accepts this. I suggest, however, that the MS. reading *ferream tunicam* may be right, that *Galliae* is not *Galli e* but *Gallia e*, and that *subcidit* is from *subcīdo*, 'afterwards Gaul cut away from the meaning in making a *lorica* of iron, and included under that name an iron shirt made of rings.' *Galli lorica* then has, *qua* expression, only a partial support from Varro: but Lucr.'s text gives *caeli lorica.* It is possible that *caeli* might be corrupted into *Galli;* but in IV. 936, *Gallo* the MSS. reading is a mistake not for *caelo* but *callo.* But even if Lachm.'s double emendation is right, would Lucr. have represented an iron cuirass as the last and greatest exhibition of the strength of iron? For this is the natural meaning of the line as it would thus stand; though Prof. Munro, perhaps aware of the difficulty, conceals it by referring *Denique* to the whole sentence 'fire which is wont to pierce even the strength

of iron where the Gaulish cuirass girds the body round.' This improbability is increased by the necessity which then arises of supposing the following line, *Morbida uisque simul cum extrinsecus insinuatur*, to be out of its place. Whereas, if *aquam* is read, all is as it should be. *Denique* is no longer weak; *Morbida uisque*, &c. is in close connexion with *caeli*, as Lucr. shows it to be at length afterwards, 1097, 1100, 1106, 1119, 1123. I defended myself before by *caeli nouitate et aquarum*, in 1103: Prof. Munro objects that *aquarum* there refers to the water which is used in drinking; as in 1126, Lucr. explains, *Aut in aquas cadit aut fruges persidit in ipsas*, by *Aut alios hominum pastus pecudumque cibatus*. I reply that in 1127 *ipsas* still seems to me to separate the food which necessarily affects the health *directly*, from water which affects it in many ways indirect as well as direct; this is in accordance with the ordinary use of *aquae* plural, either = rain, in *aquae magnae*, or of mineral or medicinal waters, *aquae caldae*, &c.: that even if this be denied in 1127, that is no reason for assigning any such limitation to 1103, as Lucr. often passes from one meaning of a word to a different one, a doctrine repeatedly enforced by Munro; and that even if 1103 *be* thus limited, that does not affect *aquam* which includes all specific senses of water and is here in opposition to *caeli lorica* as in IV. 434, *Quippe ubi nil aliud nisi aquam caelumque tuentur*. On the other hand, *Denique qua* for *denique aquam*, is like *prorumpere quorum* for *prorumpere equorum*, II. 264; whilst conversely in IV. 815, the MSS. read *praetereaquam* for *praeterquam*. To come to 956, 7, *Et tempestate in terra caeloque coorta, In caelum terrasque remotae iure facessunt*, the change from sing. to plur. is not unexampled; so in the lex Iulia Municipalis, *Queicumque frumentum populo dabunt dandumue curabit;* Cat. CXI. 1, 2, *Aufilena uiro contentam uiuere solo Nuptarum laus ex laudibus eximiis* I have already quoted; in Lucr. IV. 328, *quaecumque (imago) retro latebit* is followed by *omnia haec licebit uideantur; latebunt* is a conjecture. With regard to *facessunt*, the only passage which I have been able to find where Prof. Munro's rule does not seem to be enforced, is Liv. IV. 58, *legatis repetentibus res, ni facesserent propere*

urbe finibusque, daturos quod Lars Tolumnius dedisset responderi iussit: but the reason of that may be that the word is naturally a rough one and would be used therefore generally in commanding or threatening, directly or indirectly. In 958, *raro corpore nexum,* seems to me as certainly right as *metu quae possint numine diuae* (Lachm. *numini*) II. 623, *mente fruatur Iucundo sensu,* II. 15 (Lachm. *menti*, 'without cause' Munro). Even in v. 949, *quibus e scibant umore fluenta Lubrica profluvie larga lauere umida saxa,* v. 1410, *Maiorem interea capiunt dulcedine fructum, umori* and *dulcedini,* though accepted by both Lachm. and Munro, can hardly be considered certain, from the tendency to an abuse of ablatives which, as I said before, is so perceptible in Lucr. As to the construction, Lachm.'s words seem to mean, that, as there is no case in which the condition of cohesion is the rarity of the body, *things* being rare, and *therefore raro corpore; nihil est nisi raro corpore nexum* is impossible, and must be changed to *nisi raro corpori nexu;* this would appear to imply that he thought *raro corpore nexum,* must mean 'united by a rare body.' But, this is to assume the very point: I maintain that *raro corpore nexum,* as properly, if not more so, means 'possessed of a rare texture of body,' lit. 'woven with a rare body,' *i.e.* possessing a rare body, which forms its texture. Lachm. here, I think, puts a pressure upon language which it will not bear; much as in the line, *effluat ambrosias quasi uero e nectare tinctus,* he thinks to settle the question by a triumphant '*oleaster neque ambrosia et nectare* effluit *neque* diffluit *sed forte* affluat.' But then Lucr. knew the Cyclops line, Ἀλλὰ τόδ' ἀμβροσίης καὶ νέκταρός ἐστιν ἀποῤῥώξ, and with this in his memory, first thought of the wild olive as steeped in the gods' drink: and then, having made his solid sufficiently liquid, ventured to add a word which would be sure to recal the Greek line, *effluat;* at the same time that it conveyed the notion of coming *direct* from the fountain-head of sweetness. I translated this 'offset' as an ambiguous term, which would suit *oleaster,* and not be incongruous with the general idea of a liquid. But having used *effluat* he might add *e* to *nectare tinctus;* and this is less prosaic than *linctus*

because it conveys more than one association, and could not be understood without an admission that the language of poetry is more complex than that of prose, even when the poet is as matter-of-fact as Lucretius.

972. *Escae* is nearer *exscet* than *esca;* and surely would not require *quod* to be changed to *quo; nil est escae* is practically equivalent to *nulla est esca.* III. 498, *Qua quasi consuerunt et sunt munita uiai* is somewhat similar, in the position of the genitive, though *qua* is of course adverbial.

1135. Prof. Munro says, 'A strange atmosphere comes, say from Egypt to Athens, which by being breathed engenders disease. But the sun of Egypt does not travel with it; it is bright or gloomy, as the climate into which it comes is bright or gloomy.' No; but the sky in any given place may become unusually bright, and this may be connected with something unhealthy in the atmosphere, or at any rate may produce disease by merely being unusual, *aliquid quo non consueuimus uti.*

1199. I thought that *ut est* following an *ut est* in 1167 was likely to be genuine, and proposed to translate it in each place similarly 'as happens' (so Munro, on 1167), *i. e.* in 1199, *Quorum si quis, ut est, uitarat funera leti,* 'if any of them, as may well happen, had escaped death.' I still think *ut est* right, and do not see any necessity for explaining it in 1167 on the forced view of Lachm.; it is certainly used as an independent phrase in Cicero, Fam. XVI. 18. 1, *sed ut est, indulge ualetudini tuae,* whatever it may there signify.

I take the opportunity to propose one or two emendations.

Lucr. v. 880, 881,

Ex alienigenis membris compacta potestas,
Hinc illinc paruis ut non sat (*sit* A) *pars esse potissit.*

Read, *par uis ut* $\begin{Bmatrix} sat \\ non \end{Bmatrix}$ *par esse potissit.*

It is difficult to say whether *sat* or *non* is more likely; B reads *sat;* on the other hand the opposition of *par* to *non par*, like that of *idem* to *non idem,* is more forcible. Comp. Cels. III. 8, *ut quod idem est non idem esse uideatur.*

Aetna 120 (Munro), *Nam mille* (so Munro) *ex tenui uocemque agitata necesse est Confluuia errantes arcessant undique uenas.* For *uocemque,* read *uiolensque:* comp. *uolentia = uiolentia* in 214; *uolet, uocet* in 246.

Aetna 432, *Quamuis aeternum pinguescat et ubere sulphur,* read *pingui scatet.*

Aetna 294, *Pellet opus collectus aquae uictusque mouere Spiritus,* read *moueri.*

Addendum to 258.

Corssen speaks of *ec* in his first volume, p. 155, 2nd edition, as usual in compounds beginning with *f* in old laws and fragments of old poets down to Sallust and Cicero; and he quotes twelve instances. Two of these, *ecfatus* in a line of Ennius ap. Cic. de Div. I. 20. 41, *ecferunt* Heaut. 745, seem not to be supported by the MSS., though they were very probably so written by Ennius and Terence. Of the other passages those quoted by him from Nonius have been collated by me with the excellent Harleian MS. The first is written *ęt fero;* the second *ec ferimur;* the third *ec ferant;* a fourth not quoted by Corssen, also from Cicero, *ec ferunt.* (The MS. gives also *ecfere, ecferre, ec ferre,* in the three cases in the same article of Nonius where *ecferre* is printed by Gerlach and Roth: and so *ecferte,* 292. 19.) It will be observed that the MS. in most of these instances writes the *ec* apart like *ab alienauerit* (Corssen, p. 154); and this is confirmed by the form which it seems sometimes to assume, *haec,* e.g. in de Fato, XV. 35, Tusc. Disp. II. 16, 38, Sest. XLVIII. 102. I do *not* believe it accounts for the frequent change of *ec* to *et.*

R. ELLIS.

A PASSAGE IN ŒDIPUS REX.

ἐκ δὲ πυθμένων
ἔκλινε κοῖλα κλῆθρα. 1260, sq.

WHAT κοῖλα means is doubtful, but in two passages immediately following, κλῆθρα signifies the fastenings of the chamber-door. In Il. XIV. 167, we have,

πυκινὰς δὲ θύρας σταθμοῖσιν ἔπηρσεν
κληῖδι κρυπτῇ,

he fitted the doors closely to the jambs with a secret fastening, i.e. with a means of shutting, and so of opening, and the goddess having entered shuts the doors,

θύρας ἐπέθηκε φαεινάς.

The fastening, therefore, was on the *inside*.

It would thus appear, that the folding doors, besides the fastening in the middle, were further secured by fastenings let into the jambs on the inside, as the Greek doors opened outwards. In this way, the bolt and its box in the jamb are correlatives, and we can see the meaning of κοῖλα in Theoc. XIV. 15 referred to by Wunder,

ὅθι σταθμὰ κοῖλα θυράων,

where were the jambs pierced for the bolts, i.e. Juno called up the snakes *inside* the door, and so they make at once for the two infants, v. 20, and no mention is made of any intervening obstacle. But if the bolt and box are correlative[1], they may both be called κλῆθρα, i.e., means of security, and the meaning of the passage in Œd. Rex would be, that Œdipus gave the doors such a drive with his foot, that he not only burst them in, but dislocated the κοῖλα κλῆθρα—the boxes or sockets in

[1] Cf.

with massy staples
And corresponsive and fulfilling bolts.
Troilus and Cressida, Prologue.

the jambs—ἐκ πυθμένων, from their position. That is, the bolts acted as levers, and bent the sockets, which were κοῖλα.

THOMAS MAGUIRE.

Queen's College, Galway.

TWO PASSAGES IN VERGIL.

Ecl. I. 68—72.

En unquam patrios longo post tempore finis,
Pauperis et tuguri congestum caespite culmen,
Post aliquot, mea regna, videns mirabor aristas?
Impius haec tam culta novalia miles habebit?
Barbarus has segetes?

The general meaning is plain: My land will go to rack when I am gone. Shall I ever see it again? If I do, the change for the worse will astound me. That is, *Shall I ever, in long time to come, be surprised by the state of my hereditary farm, at the roof of my cottage* (which will then be) *deteriorated—rudely heaped with sod,* (shall I wonder) *when I see the diminished crops, where I once ruled undisputed lord* (and of course brought cultivation to a high pitch)? *Shall the lawless pensioner hold as his own, my fields now so cultivated? Shall the foreign mercenary own ground like this?* To justify the *general* interpretation we have only to explain v. 70:

Post aliquot, mea regna, videns mirabor aristas?

by the lines which precede and follow. As to the *special* points:—I take *pauperis* as a predicate, and in its strict sense of diminished in value, *damaged,* a sense preserved in the action *de pauperie* under the Twelve Tables, mentioned by Ulpian, D. 9, 1. D. 19, 5; by Paulus, S. R. I. 15; and by Justinian, Inst. IV. 9: viz. si quadrupes *pauperiem* fecisse dicitur, i.e. if a beast do damage, so that pauperis et tuguri = pauperis τοῦ tuguri. Pauperis appears to be used in its relative sense in the business-like arrangement with Priapus:

custos es pauperis horti.
Nunc te marmoreum pro tempore fecimus; at tu
Si fetura gregem suppleverit, aureus esto.

Ecl. VII. 34 sq.

Here Priapus regulates the whole produce of the *hortus*, the old word for *villa*, Plin. H. N. XIX. 4, 1, so that pauperis horti = whose produce is not what it ought to be. Of course, Statius, *pauperibus tectis*, A. I. 125, sufficiently defends the common rendering. *Caespite congestum*, I make also a predicate, which will then be rudely-heaped *con-gestum* with sods, not neatly roofed as now. *Post*, v. 70, is an abbreviation of *longo post tempore*, v. 68, repeated for emphasis. *Aliquot aristas* is *some*, as opposed to the whole—the crop I raise now, and therefore, scanty. *Videns* is pendent and does not govern *regna*, but goes with the whole sentence, like *quae cuncta videns, quid saepe videntes*, and is, in fact, the active of *videndo*. *Mea regna*, perhaps, where I was *rex*, autocrat, something like the notion in *imperat arvis*, G. I. 99. The last lines, *impius haec* sq., and *barbarus has*, denote a contrast between the present and future condition of Vergil's farm; why not the whole passage?

Æneid VII. 117—120.

Ea vox audita laborum
Prima tulit finem, primamque loquentis ab ore
Eripuit pater, ac *stupefactus* numine pressit.
Continuo, Salve, etc.

The difficulties of this passage have arisen from *eripuit*, *stupefactus*, *pressit*, and *continuo*. *Vox* is certainly the words of Iulus, *mensas consumimus*, as we may see by Æneas' quotation of Anchises' words *consumere mensas*, v. 125. Æneas also says that the words of Iulus suggested to him the prophecy transmitted by Anchises, *nunc repeto*, v. 123. Now, *continuo* in v. 120 excludes the notion of any long break between the joke of Iulus and its application by Æneas. This, then, is in favour of Heyne's interpretation of *eripuit*, namely, "excepit *ὑπελάβετο*, *ὑπεδέξατο*. Hoc enim verbum ad solam celeritatem dicentis et alterius verba excipientis referendum

esse sese memorat H., comparans Græcorum *ἁρπάζειν* et *προαρπάζειν τὰ λεγόμενα*." Forb. *l. c.*

So far all is clear; Æneas, when Iulus had made his joke, *plura alludens*, v. 117, immediately *continuo* exclaims *Salve:* that is the words *mensas consumimus* were, as a matter of fact, immediately followed by *Salve.* Now, as Æneas did not interrupt Iulus, who had finished, *nec plura*, the intermediate lines describe the mental state of Æneas, *ea vox—pressit.* Nearly all the difficulty seems to have been caused by *stupefactus*, the modern notion of which suggests temporary coma. Hence, the apparent contradiction between the presumed anæsthetic state, and the quick application of the casual joke—the apparent contradiction being intensified by the ordinary sense of *pressit vocem.* But *stupefactus* occurs in three other places in Vergil, in none of which does it convey any notion of anæsthesia, but quite the reverse: viz.

(1) Arrectae mentes, *stupefacta*que corda
Iliadum. Æn. v. 643 sq.

Here, the action of Juno, and the words *arrectae mentes*, both exclude any degree of stupefaction. The Trojan women are in a high state of excitement.

(2) *Aristaeus*, ingenti motu *stupefactus* aquarum,
Spectabat, diversa locis, Phasimque Lycumque,
Et caput, *unde* altus primum se erumpit Enipeus,
Unde pater Tyberinus, et *unde* Aniena fluenta.
Geor. IV. 365 sq.

The words italicised exclude comatoseness: Aristæus was looking with interest and wonder at the eastern and western rivers in their sources and in opposite points. In fact, *stupefactus spectabat* might describe one

Like some watcher of the skies
When a new planet swims into his ken;
Or like stout Cortez when with eagle eyes
He stared at the Pacific

ingenti motu stupefactus aquarum.

(3) Quorum stupefactae carmine lynces. Ec. VIII. 3.

The lynxes were charmed and not stupefied, that is, they

forgot their natural savage tendencies in their delight at the song, as in the hackneyed

"Music hath charms to soothe the savage breast."

As to *stupeo*, it would be tedious to go through all the passages where it occurs in Vergil, but I am satisfied that in each of them will be found either (1) such concentration of attention, or (2) such other intellectual action, as to negative the notion of bewilderment. Two passages from Statius clearly show the proper meaning of the verb:

(1) *Stupet* omine tanto
Defixus senior, divina oracula Phoebi
Agnoscens. T. I. 490 sq.

He is astonished at the strangeness of the oracle and its simple fulfilment; and

(2) Stupuit Cadmeia virgo,
Intremuitque simul, dicentemque occupat ultro.
T. XII. 38.

Here her *stupor* does not prevent her immediately *interrupting* the speaker. Having got rid of the notion of anæsthesia, we may interpret, Æneas, struck by the providential coincidence of the prophecy and the event, *pressit* vocem 'mensas consumimus,' something like our *pressed the point, insisted on the words*, as one would do with a text of Scripture, or an Act of Parliament. To the rest, including Iulus, *mensas consumimus* applied only to the bread: Æneas seeing that the joke, the fact, and the oracle, might all tally, *pressit vocem*, did actually in his own mind make the expression dove-tail with the oracle. He then bursts out with *Salve*, and applies the text. In Herodotus, VI. 65, 5, there is an analogous expression, τούτου δὴ ἐπιβατεύων τοῦ ῥήματος, as we say *getting hold of the expression*, and this I think might possibly be rendered *pressit vocem*. The exact shade of meaning in *pressit* is not so clear, and may be *follows up, presses hard*, as in

Apri cursum clamore prementem. Æn. I. 328:

see Henry's note on *premit* hasta, Æn. II. 529, p. 97.

THOMAS MAGUIRE.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, GALWAY.

METHODISCHE GRAMMATIK DER GRIECHISCHEN SPRACHE. Von Rudolf Westphal. Erster Theil. Erste Abtheilung. Jena. Mauke's Verlag. 1870.

This is the first section of the first part of a new Greek Grammar. In a very interesting preface, M. Westphal tells us that it was his original intention to publish a Greek Syntax only. In this he intended to proceed upon more advanced principles than those laid down in Hermann's tract *De emendanda Graecae Grammaticae ratione*, and embody the results of Comparative Grammar, so far as it can be said that there are any results affecting syntax. But as the work progressed, he found it impossible to separate the explanation of the use of a word from the explanation of its form, especially in the cases. The plan, at first adopted, of prefixing an account of the form of a word to the account of the use of it, seemed unsatisfactory as he proceeded with it. For such accounts must of necessity be brief—too brief to satisfy those who are not acquainted with the changes rendered necessary in accidence by Comparative Grammar. To such the mere results of the latest enquiries would appear as dogmatic and unfounded innovations, unless some explanation were given of the reasons why these changes are not only possible but requisite. But to introduce long discussions on various points of accidence would disturb the arrangement of the syntax. Hence the author concluded to separate the two elements, and write such an accidence as should be sufficient to explain his syntax. The work has grown under his hands considerably beyond the destined limits; so much so, that in this first section, comprising merely the 'Lautlehre' and declensions, we have a volume of 445 pages.

The grammar is entitled 'methodic.' It is in virtue of his exact method that M. Westphal claims a hearing among the multitude of grammars already in existence. These are his own words in the Preface, p. xii. 'The main point, and also it must be confessed the most difficult of attainment, which I had set before myself in the accidence, was the methodical arrangement of the contents. There was to be no anticipation in an earlier chapter of what ought to be said in a later one; no repetition of a subject already once discussed. These are two faults which no grammarian hitherto has escaped, and if I have succeeded in avoiding them it is owing to the constant revisions which I made of my work while in progress.'

The ideal grammar then is one which shall unfold the development of the language in even and regular progression from the first page to the last. Nothing comes before its place, but everything in its place. A high ideal, combining with the certainty of scientific knowledge the charm of perfect organization. But the reader is compelled to ask—Is such a methodical arrangement possible or desirable in grammar? and has M. Westphal succeeded in his attempt to attain it?

Nothing is so delicate or so intricate as the network woven by the genius of Language. Sound, thought, intonation, accent, all these meet and mingle in every utterance; to treat any one apart from the other tends to give us a false notion of the real nature of language. The division into sounds, stems and words is correct and useful, yet sounds are but a part of stems, stems of words, words of sentences; and the mind hastens from one to the other impatiently till the whole structure is before it. We do not rightly understand stems till we know something of words; even the various parts of speech are independent in nothing but name: nouns postulate verbs, and the separation of adverbs and prepositions is positively misleading in many ways. So too of the cases. The form and the usage are almost inseparable. To a certain extent accidence is ever determined by syntax, and syntax by accidence: and the one cannot be thoroughly understood without the other. A method which would separate too severely these delicately interwoven meshes, has a tendency to become artis-

tic and factitious. In the place of the free growth and development of language it presents us with a structure organized after the will of the grammarian. Perfect arrangement is only possible among lifeless structures; but in language we must study not the forms merely but the life.

Moreover, he who would make his knowledge methodical in the way that M. Westphal proposes would be in danger of spending some years in the study of Greek without being able to construe a single Greek sentence of the language. For instance, the account of the vowel declension is followed by a list *in extenso* of all the stems which belong to it, and not till these are mastered do we arrive at the second or consonantal declension. This is as if anyone beginning the study of Greek should learn Μοῦσα and λόγος, and then look out in his lexicon every word ending in the terminations *-α* and *-ος* before he proceeded further in the study of the declensions. Such a one would be methodical, without doubt; but his gain would not be great. His memory would be taxed to the utmost, but his analytical knowledge of the Greek language would not be increased in the slightest degree. And so here. It cannot be said that a classification of the stems belonging to the vowel declension throws much light upon it, or explains any difficulties attending it. There are certain types, κριτής, τιμή, Μοῦσα, νεανίας, ἄνθρωπος, νέως, &c. When we have mastered these it is indifferent whether we see them in one example or a thousand. He would not be a good teacher of Euclid who insisted on placing all the letters of the alphabet in turn upon the points of his diagram in order to ensure completeness. No doubt, we need a complete list of stems, but would it not be better to gather them all together under a 'Stammlehre,' and arrange them conveniently for reference according to their meaning and form?

It is not surprising that M. Westphal has fallen into difficulties in his attempt to carry out such a severely methodic arrangement. Thus in the first declension-class, he takes the *o* nouns before the *a* nouns, in order to avoid the inconvenience of teaching τιμή, λόγος, &c. and ἀγαθός, ἀγαθή. And yet it may be said that *o* must on any theory be regarded as a modifica-

tion of *a*, and therefore if you teach λόγος before *σοφία*, you teach the modified vowel before the vowel of which it is a modification. Is this 'methodic'? Again, the participles are treated as nouns. But the modifications which their stems undergo in order to express differences of tense connect these words inseparably with the verb. To treat them without allusion to their temporal element is to ignore their real nature, and yet to mention it would destroy M. Westphal's 'method,' for the distinction of time belongs properly to the verb.

It is time to turn to something more special. The grammar is so full, and presents such a field for discussion, that it will be impossible to do more than select a few of the points in which the author differs from other grammars.

i. In regard to the classification of declensions, the criterion is allowed to be the final letter of the stem, so that we get two main declensions, a vowel declension and a consonant declension. To the first belong all stems ending in *-a* or *-o*, and to the second all stems ending in consonants or in the soft vowels *ι* and *υ*. This is the arrangement of Professor Curtius: and undoubtedly it is open, at first sight, to the objection that in principle we establish a distinction between vowels and consonants which is neglected in practice. The answer, of course, is that *ι* and *υ* in declension develope a semivowel, and *ι* becomes *ij*, *υ*, *uv*. M. Westphal adopts another terminology. He returns to the old distinction between parisyllabic and imparisyllabic declensions. Practically this amounts to a distinction between a vowel and consonant declension, because it so happens that the Attic dialect, which M. Westphal considers as typical, never or rarely uses the open forms of the vowel declensions, and thus preserves the same number of syllables throughout. But this is merely a dialectical peculiarity. To found a scientific distinction upon it is barely permissible to us who know that Μουσάων is not derived from Μουσῶν, but that the reverse is the case. It was permissible for the ancient Greek grammarians to adopt such a distinction because they regarded all forms as derived from the Attic, but such theories have been utterly swept away by modern science, which knows nothing of those 'additions,' &c. by which in various cases

the parisyllabic declension ceased to be parisyllabic. Moreover, the classification cannot be thoroughly carried out. In which class are we to place words like *αἰδώς*? They are parisyllabic in form, and yet M. Westphal includes them in the second or imparisyllabic class, because he regards them as formed from stems in ς, and therefore to be placed side by side with *γένος*. The genitive therefore was *αἰδοσ-ος*, and has become *αἰδοῦς* merely by contraction. But what are we to say of *ἀνθρώπου*? Is it not a contraction from *ἀνθράποιο*?

ii. The various forms of the genitive singular are a source of difficulty in Greek Philology. It is not easy to reduce them all to one form, and yet why should we have two forms for one and the same case? *θεν* it is true is sometimes used for the genitive, so that we have two distinct forms of this case, but it is also used for relations in which the common form of the genitive is never used; and the meaning of the suffix is there clearly different from that of the usual genitive, however nearly the two may approach in other instances But the different forms of the genitive, *Μούσης*, *νεανίου*, *ἀνθρώπου* (from *ἀνθρώποιο*) and *πατρίδος*, do not display the slightest variation of meaning. In his explanation of this case Curtius adopts two original forms: one in *-as*, in which the vowel was long in feminine nouns, and another in *-sja*; and he proceeds thus in his analysis: *Μουσᾱjās*, *Μουσα-as*, *Μούσης*, *νεανιᾱjăς*, *νεανιᾱος*, *νεανιᾱο*, *νεανίου*, *ἀνθρωποσjο*, *ἀνθρώποιο*, *ἀνθρώποο*, *ἀνθρώπου*. *πατρίδος* retains the original form. The *j* when it occurs may be considered part of the stem, so that we have

Μουσᾱ-j-	*ās*
νεανιᾱ-j-	*as*
πατρίδ-	*ος*
ἀνθρωπο-	*σjo.*

The evidence for these forms is taken chiefly from Sanskrit, in which the feminine *a*-stems have a genitive in *-ājās*, and the masculines a genitive in *-sja*. Bopp, with whom Schleicher is inclined to agree, considers that the masculine nouns in *a*, like those in *o*, had a genitive formed by *sja*. However this may be, the number of hypothetical forms remains the same.

M. Westphal prefers to reduce all the terminations to one form *-aς*, or with Greek modification of the vowel *-oς*. This he considers the original form in all stems whether masculine or feminine, whether ending in vowels or consonants. But in the *o*-stems and *a*-stems a euphonic *j* has been inserted between the stem and termination. Thus we get the following table:

Μουσα-j-	*ας*
νεανια-j-	*ος*
ἀνθρωπο-j-	*ος*
πατρίδ-	*ος.*

This arrangement has simplicity on its side: and though the hypothetical form *ἀνθρωπο-j-ος* is farther removed than *ἀνθρωποσjο* from the Sanskrit genitive in *-sja*, it presents a much nearer parallel to the Latin *quo-i-us*, stem *quo; hu-j-us*, stem *ho*. In Umbrian too we have *puples* as a form of the genitive; and *suveis* as the Oscan equivalent of *sui*. For the Greek-Italian period it would not be rash to assume a genitive of *o*-stems ending in *s*, and at the same time a tendency, more developed in Latin than in Greek, to reject *s* after a vowel[1].

iii. Curtius explains forms of the dual like *οἴκοιιν* as arising from *οἰκο-φιν*, the *φιν* being the Greek counterpart of the Sanskrit dual termination *bhyam*. By epenthesis *οἰκο-φιν* would become *οἰκοι-φιν*, and by loss of the aspirate, *οἴκοιιν*. But M. Westphal regards the *ι* in the stem as euphonic, 'the same euphonic sound which we meet with in the genitive singular of the *o*-stems.' 'The termination is *-ιν*, which stands in close phonetic connection with the dative termination in *-ις*.' Here M. Westphal leaves comparative grammarians far behind him, and wanders into a *terra incognita*. What is *-ις* or *-ιν*? Surely

[1] This is what may be said in behalf of M. Westphal's theory. On the other hand it must be borne in mind that Greek does not reject *s in fine* after short vowels, and Latin does not reject it after long vowels. There is therefore no reason why *ἀνθρωποjος* should become *ἀνθρωποjο*, or *Musāīs*, *Musāī*. And if to avoid this difficulty, in Latin at least, we assume a form *Musāīs*, we are at a loss to account for the long i in *Musāi*. On this form of the genitive Mr Nettleship's review of Corssen, and Professor Max Müller's note upon it should be consulted. They will be found in the *Academy*, Dec. 14, Jan. 15.

the agreement between the dual dative and genitive in *-ιν* with the Sanskrit in *bhyam* is too probable to be set aside until we have something certain to put in the place of it. The objection to the comparison, of course, is that we have no relic of a Greek dual in *-φιν*; nor is the omission of *φ* a common occurrence in phonology.

iv. In page ix. of the preface, where the author is explaining why his book has taken the form in which we find it, he gives an account of the difficulties which beset the attempt to separate accidence and syntax. 'In treating of the Semasiology of the Greek dative, I must give an account of the peculiar Greek usage which combines the dative with locative and instrumental prepositions, in opposition to the Latin use, which never combines the dative with such prepositions. The Greek said *σὺν πατρί*, *ἐν πατρί*, but in Latin *cum patri*, *in patri* is impossible. It is impossible because in Latin the dative is really a dative, whereas what is called a dative in Greek is sometimes a dative, and sometimes a locative, according to the difference of declensions: and therefore it can sometimes discharge the functions of a dative proper, and sometimes of a locative. It is as the latter that it is combined with prepositions of locative signification. The criterion of the distinction here drawn is the long vowel. The final *ι* in *πατρί* is short and marks the word as a locative: but in *patri* the final vowel is long, the remnant of an original dative termination *ai*, and marks the word as a dative proper, which cannot therefore enter into combination with prepositions of locative meaning.'

This is no doubt true: but is it the whole truth? If the Greek dative, so called, takes the preposition as a locative, and by virtue of the short *ι*, what are we to say of *ἐν οἴκῳ* when *ἐν οἴκοι* was possible (we actually find *ἐν Πριανσιοῖ*)? In Latin too locatives like *ruri* have the long vowel no less than datives like *patri;* and they also, like the dative, are never used with prepositions; on the contrary the locative signification is just that which seems least to need the aid of prepositions, within certain limits. The reason of this difference in the use of cases in Latin and Greek seems to be that as cases become

more vague, the need of prepositions is felt, while they are not required in those which preserve their original force. Now in Latin the accusative and ablative became vague, and therefore required to be further defined by prepositions. In Greek the genitive and dative also in addition to the accusative lost their original force. But it is noticeable that the genitive and dative in Greek both perform functions of the Latin ablative, which is used with prepositions. It would be interesting to enquire how far the prepositional use in both languages is parallel.

v. M. Westphal would regard the δ in ἔρις, ἔριδος as euphonic merely: and this is intelligible, inasmuch as it is sometimes inserted and sometimes omitted; but it is not justifiable to hold the same opinion of the δ in λαμπάς, λαμπάδος. We never find the form λαμπαν, but the δ is retained throughout the declension except in nomin. sing. and dat. pl., where the omission of it is required by the laws of euphony. Would it not be more true to say that ἀγριας, ἀγριάδος for instance is a separate feminine formation from a stem ἀγριο, which by the addition of *ja*, as in the feminines of participles, would give us ἀγρια-*ja*-ς, and then by a not unintelligible process, ἀγριαδς, than to regard the *j* as simply euphonic? Such an analysis though attended with difficulties, e. g. the retaining of the final ς after the feminine *ja*, would clear up the origin of the δ, and leave it part of the stem.

vi. Once more, on p. 323 will be found an explanation of the difficult nouns in -ω; on p. 363 an account of nouns end- in -ως. Αἰδώς and ἠώς are treated together with γέλως, ἱδρώς, πάτρως, μήτρως, and the feminines in -ω are regarded as formations from stems in -ος. This is contrary to the views of Curtius, who deserves indeed more attention than he receives from M. Westphal in this particular point. We have here an instance of a tendency which runs throughout the volume, to group together words of identical termination without sufficient regard to the stems. We may regard the τ as euphonic in ἵδρως, just as it is in χάρις; but that will not bring the stem into harmony with the stem of πάτρως or ἥρως. Moreover the presence of a euphonic letter constitutes a real peculiarity of

declension. Then the theory which regards feminines in *-ω* as formations with digamma does not rest 'solely on the four Ionic accusatives in *-ουν*.' There is the analogous class of words in *-ως*, which when compared with their Latin counterparts, *πάτρως* with *patruus*, seem to require the digamma in their formation, and to be quite distinct from the sigma stems *αἰδώς*, *ἠώς*, *ἥρως* with which M. Westphal classes them.

These are a few points among very many which the grammar presents for discussion. They will show how independently M. Westphal has gone to work, how little he has allowed himself to be carried away by prescription, or what may be called orthodoxy in grammar. But they will give but a little idea of the immense amount of materials collected even in the first part, and the unflinching determination on the part of the author to leave nothing without illustration or explanation. The accentuation for instance is treated in a most interesting manner, and the endeavour made to establish general principles. Whether we agree with the author or not, the book so far as it has gone deserves respectful attention, and what is to come promises to be even more interesting still. It is to be regretted that the misprints are very numerous.

E. ABBOTT.

NOTES ON THE TRANSLATION OF GENESIS.

The warning of Cain. Gen. iv. 6, 7.

VERY much labour has been expended, but without satisfactory result, upon the concluding verse of the following passage:

"And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the LORD. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof. And the LORD had respect unto Abel, and to his offering: but unto Cain and to his offering He had not respect. And Cain was very wroth and his countenance fell. And the LORD said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? *If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.*" Gen. iv. 3—7.

This rendering is inconsistent with itself, as it may be well to remark before discussing it grammatically. Sin expectant does not truly correspond to evil accomplished. "If thou doest not well," sin no longer lurks at the door but has entered and seized its prey[1]. Some have accordingly understood by "sin" the *punishment* of sin. "If thou doest not well punishment awaits thee." Whilst others would render, "*Si bene egeris, acceptaberis: sin male, nihilominus sacrificium expiatorium pro peccato ad ostium cubat* (solebant enim sacrificia poni ad ostium Sanctuarii), *i. e.* Tibi pœnitenti est spes veniæ." These two classes of commentators have recognized one condition of the problem before us which is now commonly ignored; but as

[1] I suppose that in a paraphrase we might read *sinnest* in place of *doest not well*, &c., thus: "If thou sinnest, sin lieth in wait for thee; yet thou mayest foil him, and avoid sinning." See next note.

regards the word "sin" it is perhaps better to adhere to the view which makes it symbolize under the form of a wild beast[1] the principle of evil. If Cain successfully resists temptation he "rules over" sin: if on the contrary he falls into sin, then sin *ipso facto* has dominion over him[2]; and sin "lies at the door" only so long as it is doubtful whether or not the man's passion will goad him on to evil.

With these remarks I pass on to consider the passage in detail.

The LXX. reads:

οὐκ ἐὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, ἥμαρτες; ἡσύχασον· πρὸς σὲ ἡ ἀποστροφὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ σὺ ἄρξεις αὐτοῦ.

This Greek version is allowed to be very inadequate in many particulars, but its opening words suggest what is probably the right[3] construction of תֵּיטִיב שְׂאֵת. If now the accents be regarded, there appears a symmetry in ver. 6, 7 which the English version obliterates; the original, after the introductory clause, *And the Lord said unto Cain,* falling naturally into the rhythmical form,

למה חרה לך
ולמה נפלו פניך
הלא אם־תיטיב שאת
ואם לא תיטיב
לפתח חטאת רבץ
ואליך תשוקתו
ואתה תמשל־בו׃

[1] Compare 1 Pet. v. 8.

[2] Compare Rom. vi. 12, 14: "Let not sin therefore *reign* in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.....For sin *shall not have dominion over you.*" Here we have an exact counterpart of the אתה תמשל בו of Gen. iv. 7. In neither passage are we to suppose that the domination of sin over a man is something subsequent to his doing evil. The two are contemporaneous or coincident.

[3] And no doubt the simplest. Compare היטיבו נגן (Ps. xxxiii. 3). See for the same and some other constructions, Deut. xiii. 15; 1 Sam. xvi. 17; 2 Kings xi. 18; Is. xxiii. 16; Jer. i. 12; Ezek. xxxiii. 32; Jon. iv. 9; Prov. xv. 13, xxx. 29.

where we have a sequence of ternary lines concluded by two binaries.

The meaning of the first two lines is clearly: "Why art thou inflamed-with-rage, and why hath thy countenance *fallen?*"

The next line contains an infinitive of the common word נשא *to lift up;* and the context suggests that it refers to the lifting up of Cain's *countenance* which was said to have fallen. If the falling of the countenance here denotes a yielding to anger and vexation, the lifting up of the countenance must denote a recovery therefrom.

It has been remarked above that the LXX rendering suggests the propriety of connecting תיטיב immediately with שאת. An exact rendering of אם תיטיב שאת is: "If thou shalt do well to-lift-up[1]." The word, "to do well," when used with an infinitive thus following, imports the vigorous, skilful, or successful performance of the action expressed by the verb which is in the infinitive. In such cases it is sometimes said to be used *adverbially*, and may be replaced in English by an adverb, as in 1 Sam. xvi. 17: "And Saul said unto his servants, Provide me now a man that can play[2] *well*, and bring him to me." In Gen. iv. 7 the meaning seems to be: *If thou shalt well lift up* (sc. *thy countenance*); i. e., *If thou shalt thoroughly recover* (sc. *from thy passion*).

If the preceding clause has been interpreted rightly, it seems evident that after the second תיטיב we must supply שאת. Now, making the ו disjunctive, we have the alternatives: If thou shalt succeed in lifting up (thy countenance), or if thou shalt not succeed (in lifting up thy countenance), in other words:

> Whether thou shalt recover from thy passion,
> Or whether thou shalt not recover—

the אם...ואם corresponding as in Ezek. ii. 5: "And they, *whether* they will hear, *or whether* they will forbear (for they

[1] The force of תיטיב might be preserved by the colloquial form of expression, *to get well over* it, sc. thy passion.

[2] The infinitive may or may not have ל prefixed. See note 3, p. 292.

are a rebellious house), yet shall they know that there hath been a prophet among them."

Compare further, Eccl. xii. 14: "for God will bring every work to the judgment appointed over every secret thing, whether it be good or evil" (Ginsburg), i. e. *to see whether it be good or whether it be evil*[1].

We now come to the line, "Sin lieth at the door."

The alternatives of *recovery* and *non-recovery* from passion having been stated, it follows naturally that sin, like a wild beast seeking prey, awaits its opportunity: sin lieth at the door waiting to see whether thou wilt regain thy composure, or whether thou wilt not regain it. Man's passion is the Tempter's opportunity, and it depends upon Cain's giving way or not giving way to his vexation whether or not he is to fall into the hands of sin. "Cease from anger, and forsake wrath: fret not thyself [for the result is] only to do evil" (Ps. xxxvii. 8).

The idea is precisely similar in Gen. iv. 6, 7[2], not to mention the verbal correspondence of חרה with תתחר[3].

The two binary lines bear a striking resemblance to the second hemistich of Gen. iii. 16,

ואל־אישך תשוקתך
והוא ימשל־בך׃

Here two distinct things are said, (1) that the woman should be actuated by ardent longing for her husband, and (2) that he should have the mastery over her. So in Gen. iv. 7 it is said in line 6, that sin, under the figure of a wild beast, is actuated by ardent longing for Cain, a desire to have him for its prey; and, in line 7, that "thou Cain mayest have the mastery over him, viz. sin." There are two ways of connecting these ideas:—

(1) "To thee is his desire;" sin longs to have thee for a prey, "YET mayest thou prevail over him."

[1] אם טוב ואם רע.

[2] We have the same combination of ideas in Eph. iv. 26, 27 as in Gen. iv. 7. Wrath—even righteous indignation unduly indulged—gives the tempter his *opportunity*. "Be ye angry, and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath: Neither give place to the devil." Cp. James i. 20.

[3] אל תתחר אך להרע.

(2) "To thee is his desire;" this desire, or its gratification, representing one alternative: "OR thou mayest prevail over him," which represents the other alternative. Thus we have an introverted parallelism, wherein lines 3, 4 correspond respectively to lines 7, 6.

The passage as a whole is far from easy to translate literally, but the meaning which I have attempted to bring out may be roughly represented as follows:

Why art thou wroth?
And why is thy look downcast?
Doth not sin couch[1] at the door,
Whether haply thou wilt look up,
Or whether thou wilt not look up?
And unto thee is his desire,
And thou mayest have the mastery over him.

P.S. I find that Kalisch mentions as a rendering to be rejected, "whether thou bearest it calmly or not (*Solomon*)." This seems to give the construction above advocated. I cannot say whether I had noticed it before forming my view of the passage. I have not the opportunity of referring to this translation.

The sons of God and the daughters of men. Gen. vi. 1—4.

There are three points in this passage which I proceed to notice:

I. Who were the sons of *the Elohim?*

Kurtz thus states the leading views: "(1) They are represented as *filii magnatum puellas plebeias rapientes.* (2) They are supposed to have been angels; or (3) pious persons, the descendants of Seth, while the daughters of men are supposed to have been descendants of Cain. The first mentioned is the view of the *Samaritan* version, of *Jonathan, Onkelos, Symma-*

[1] This word is used for רבץ in Gen. xlix. 9 and Deut. xxxiii. 13.

chus, Aben Ezra, Rashi, Varenius, &c., but is at present generally abandoned."

It will be gathered from this that the first view has great traditional authority: I may also remark in passing that the root *Elohim* seems to have been treated not quite exhaustively; something remains to be said about it which would tend to remove the first instinctive objection to the "abandoned" view of the passage before us; but at any rate we ought to allow in translating for a view which is so strongly supported, unless we are satisfied that the evidence against it is overwhelming. This might be done by introducing a marginal reading, "sons of *the Elohim,*" which exactly reproduces the ambiguity of the original.

II. Who were the *Nephilim?* Were they the offspring of these sons of Elohim and the daughters of men? or did their existence merely synchronize with the unions spoken of? The Authorized rendering of ver. 4, wherein the Nephilim are mentioned, is obscure and unsatisfactory:

"There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown."

The Hebrew runs:

הנפלים היו בארץ בימים ההם וגם אחרי כן
אשר יבאו בני האלהים אל בנות האדם וילדו להם
המה הגברים אשר מעולם אנשי השם׃

How is the first אשר to be taken? Why not in the sense *whom,* as an accusative after ילדו, thus:

"*Whom*—the sons of God went in unto the daughters of men and—*they bare* unto them"?

It is scarcely necessary to remark that the particle אשר may impress a relative sense on even much longer passages than the foregoing; nor is it any objection to the proposed

rendering that a subordinate clause יבאו וגו׳ intervenes. Compare Gen. iii. 11; Exod. vi. 8, xviii. 3, 4; Numb. xii. 12, xx. 13; Deut. xxviii. 68; Nehem. ix. 29; Isai. xxviii. 4; Ezek. xx. 21. The second passage of Numbers here cited is, as I arrange it, strikingly similar in construction to Gen. vi. 4.

המה מי מריבה אשר רבו בני ישראל את יהוה
ויקדש בם׃

"These are the waters of Meribah, *which*—the children of Israel strove with Jehovah and—He was sanctified *in them*."

There is no difficulty about supposing the effect of the relative particle אשר to be transmitted, as here, through an Ethnach. It may be carried on even from one verse to another, as in Exod. xviii. 3, 4.

Now to return to the passage illustrated—if the proposed arrangement be right, the Nephilim are identified with the offspring of the "sons of God."

"*The Nephilim* arose in the earth in those days and thenceforward (i.e. from the continued series of marriages); *whom* (i.e. the Nephilim)—the sons of the Elohim went in unto the daughters of men and—*they bare* unto them. These be those mighty men who from time immemorial were men of renown."

It will be seen that the punctuation here adopted agrees better with the accents than does that of the Authorized Version, which would require the Ethnach to be on הרם.

III. The third point to be considered is the rendering of בְּשַׁגַּם הוא בשר in Gen. vi. 3.

A prejudice, to which I must plead guilty, is felt against the view that בשגם is a contraction for בַּאֲשֶׁר גַּם; but after considering the renderings by which it has been proposed to supersede this traditional view, I am driven to the conclusion that they are very feebly supported. Moreover the objections to the traditional view are much exaggerated.

Rosenmüller writes: "בְּשַׁגַּם plerisque est Particula Caussalis ex Præfixis בְּ, שֶׁ, et גַּם composita, sicuti plerique veterum

statuerunt; atque verba בשגם הוא בשר sic vertunt: *quia etiam caro est.* Verum ut taceamus גם, *etiam,* hic plane otiosum esse, deberet vox ex tribus istis Particulis composita aliis punctis vocalibus instructa esse, et בְּשַׁגַּם efferri. Accedit, quod hujusmodi Particularum compositiones seriori tantum Hebraismo, seu potius stylo Rabbinico sint propriæ."

1. Now in the rendering *quia etiam caro est,* it may be granted that גם is made "plane otiosum," or at least that no suitable emphasis is given to it. But why is the emphatic הוא not expressed? The sentence had gone forth against all flesh: the Divine Spirit dwelt in man, and gave him a pre-eminence: but he had degraded himself: "*he also*" like the brutes "is flesh": let him perish with them. It cannot be said that this makes the גם otiose.

2. As for the contraction of אשר into ש, and withal with the required pointing, it is found explicitly in Judg. v. 7[1], עַד שַׁקַּמְתִּי דְבוֹרָה, "until *that I* Deborah *arose;*" and with compensation for Dagesh in Judg. vi. 17: "shew me a sign *that thou talkest* with me, שְׁאַתָּה מְדַבֵּר עִמִּי." The only difficulty about the pointing is in the last syllable, where we have גַּם instead of גַּם. This however involves nothing more than the ordinary lengthening of a short vowel into its corresponding long vowel, and the difficulty is therefore not insuperable[2].

It is proposed by Gesenius to assume an anomalous infinitive form שַׁג. For this, רַד (Is. xlv. 1) and שַׁךְ (Jer. v. 26) are referred to. The latter illustration would be the more effective, since letters of the same organ are liable to similar phonetic vowel-changes; but (1) perhaps שַׁךְ itself is not an infinitive[3], and (2) the collocation of singular and plural—

[1] And, of later books, in Cant. i. 7.

[2] Keil and Delitzsch seem to make no difficulty about the form of בשגם, and object only to the supposed incongruous emphasis in גם. For my own part, *if* the contraction be once granted, I cannot see any further difficulty.

[3] *Journal of Philology,* No. 3, pp. 132, 4.

"in *their* erring *he* is flesh"—is extremely harsh[1]. Fürst makes שגם an adverb-form.

To conclude, whatever objection may be felt to the traditional view that בשגם stands for באשר גם, there would seem to be no other known explanation which could reasonably be substituted for it. The Authorized rendering is well suited to the context; as would be the slightly modified rendering: "with (or *in*) one who (באשר) is, even he (גם הוא), flesh." It should also be noted that the contraction which is objected to may after all be comparatively modern. An original באשר גם may have come to be pronounced and afterwards written briefly בשגם.

The so-called WINDOW *of the Ark,* Gen. vi. 16.

צהר תעשה לתבה
ואל אמה תכלנה מלמעלה:

It is now commonly assumed that the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, çohar* means *light;* and hence is deduced the meaning *aperture for light:* "A *window* shalt thou make to the ark, and in a cubit shalt thou finish *it* above." In answer to the objection that a single window would thus seem to be described, and that too of such small dimensions as to be wholly inadequate, it is argued that *çohar* should be taken collectively: "usque ad ulnæ longitudinem facias eam, i. e. lucem, *fenestras.*" This would however still leave the description of the "windows" very vague, (1) as regards position, and (2) as regards dimensions, whereof only one would be given. Moreover the collective rendering, though defensible in the abstract, seems here to have been devised in answer to objections, and is not naturally suggested by the context. Others take *çohar* to mean internal light, rather than an aperture for light, and refer the words, "shalt thou finish *it*" to the *ark,* and not to the *çohar.* But it

[1] As Keil and Delitzsch allow. Fürst goes further and *rejects* this construction.

seems unnatural to make the mention of the lighting of the ark precede the directions given for closing it in at the top and thus making some lighting apparatus necessary: the order would be more natural if the clauses, "light shalt thou make to the ark," and, "to a cubit shalt thou finish IT," were interchanged. Moreover the repetition of the word ark in the next clause: "and the door of *the ark* shalt thou set in the side thereof," is on the whole favourable to the view which refers "IT" to the *çohar*[1]: at least, on this supposition it is necessary, but on the other unnecessary, to repeat the word *ark*.

As regards tradition, the force of the argument in favour of the meaning *aperture for light* is overestimated. Jewish authorities may favour the meaning *light*, but they differ in their application of it. The Greek versions shew signs of perplexity rather than of agreement.

Theodotion is quoted for the unique rendering *θύραν*. The LXX. does not favour the meaning *light*, but reads, for: "A *çohar* shalt thou make, &c.,"

καὶ ἐπισυνάγων ποιήσεις τὴν κιβωτὸν καὶ εἰς πῆχυν συντελέσεις αὐτὴν ἄνωθεν.

Here instead of the substantive *çohar*[2] we have the participle *ἐπισυνάγων*, and the meaning seems to be that the ark was to contract and grow narrower towards the top. This LXX. rendering may be indefensible as a whole, but it suggests a view which has been proposed by Alb. Schultens, and dismissed perhaps too summarily by Gesenius (*Thesaur.* 1152. b):

"*Dorsum arcæ* i.e. tectum (v. מְכַסֶּה viii. 13) intelligebant Alb. Schult. c. dial. p. 287 et J. D. Mich. in suppl. coll. ظهر *dorsum*, ظهرة testudo: sed illud [i.e. the meaning *lumen*] cum certo linguæ usu magis convenit."

But the sequence of meanings in Hebrew under the root in

[1] Some say that, while the affix is feminine, צֹהַר from its form must be masculine. But Rosenmüller remarks, "plura hujus formæ nomina sunt *feminina*." Compare אֹזֶן שְׁמֻעָת (Prov. xv. 31). In Hos. i. 3, גֹּמֶר is a woman's name.

[2] Or (as a paraphrase) for צהר ל.

question is far from being clearly ascertained; while the comparison of the Arabic root ظهر is wholly favourable to the view of Schultens. These points will be considered in the sequel, meanwhile I proceed to shew that the meaning *roof* is very suitable to the context of *çohar*.

I. *The argument from the context.*

The ark is thus described. "The length of the ark shall be three hundred cubits, the breadth of it fifty cubits, and the height of it thirty cubits. A *çohar* shalt thou make to the ark and *to a cubit* shalt thou finish it *from above;* and the door of the ark shalt thou set in the side thereof; with lower, second, and third stories shalt thou make it" (Gen. vi. 15, 16). Here (1) I have transliterated the disputed word צהר, (2) I have departed from the Authorized Version by rendering אל אמה literally, TO *a cubit*, and (3) I have rendered מלמעלה FROM *above*[1], again departing from the Authorized Version, which reads simply, *above*.

Now according to the usual interpretation we have, to begin with, an exact statement of the dimensions of the ark, its length, its breadth, and its height. Then comes a notice of a window or windows, whereof only one dimension is given; neither is it made clear where they are to be placed, as witness Kalisch: "It was to be provided with a door at the side, and with windows in the upper part (ver. 15), *or* the roof (viii. 13)." But if the ark was to be exposed to a heavy rainfall the roof would not have been a very natural place for apertures[2]; and it would appear from the context that the *çohar*

[1] I do not lay stress on this, but only on the rendering "roof." See also p. 327.

[2] Some, as Lange, have conjectured that the ark was glazed. "We suppose, therefore, with Baumgarten, that it [צהר] must be regarded as a light-opening in the deck, which was continued through the different stories. Against the rain and the water dashing must this opening have been closed in some way by means of some transparent substance; for which purpose a trellice or lattice-work would not have been sufficient. The expression 'to a cubit' denotes also precaution."

was not to be in "the side," whereof the mention comes in quite supplementarily in the immediate sequel. Moreover, according to the received view no plain mention is made of that very important part, the roof. If however *çohar* itself means *roof,* everything becomes clear: "Thou shalt make a sloping *roof* to the ark, and this roof shalt thou finish off *to* the extent of *a cubit* measuring *from above.*" The roof was to project and depend to the extent of a cubit from the top of the sides of the ark: it would form eaves, under which doors or windows would naturally be placed; and after the provision for a watershed by which the sides of the ark would be protected, we are prepared for the direction which now follows: "the *door* of the ark shalt thou set in the side thereof."

II. *On the Hebrew root* צהר.

We have next to inquire into the sequence of meanings in the words:

noon	צָהֳרַיִם
oil	יִצְהָר
make oil (?)	הִצְהִיר ,

and to consider whether there is any thing in Biblical usage which forbids us to render צֹהַר in Gen. vi. 16 by *roof.*

According to the usual view, "*noon*" is described as the time of double or most intense light, so that the singular צֹהַר would mean *light:* "*oil*" is then thought to be named from its brightness: and the verb is taken by some to be a denominative from יִצְהָר, and by others to be a denominative from צָהֳרַיִם. It is not however quite clear that the choice of meanings for the verb lies between the two thus obtained, viz. (1) *make oil,* (2) *labour at noon.* The verb itself occurs once only, and all that seems certain about the Biblical ap-

plications of the root is that יְצְהָר means *oil,* and צָהֳרַיִם *noon.*

In Gen. vi. 16, above considered, the meaning *roof* is perhaps the most suitable for the singular צֹהַר. The idea of *dorsum, ridge, convex* or *uppermost surface,* leads also to an explanation of

צָהֳרַיִם] which denotes the time of the Sun's *culmination.* If it be required to explain the dual form[1] of the word, it may be said that during the first half of the day the sun is mounting the eastern slope of the heavens, and during the second half is descending the western slope, while at *noon* it stands upon the ridge which joins the two, and therefore on both at once. Perhaps, however, the dual form is to be otherwise explained, for it does not appear in the Arabic ظُهْر, ظَهِيرَة, which are explicable with simple reference to culmination[2]. If צָהֳרַיִם refers broadly to the middle part of the day, this derivation is at least equally appropriate with that from "light"; while if the word refers properly to the *moment* of noon, the latter derivation seems less satisfactory than the former, since it is less easy to determine the moment of midday by judging of the intensity of the light than by judging of the sun's position, and it might be expected that the simplest way of determining midday would be chosen instinctively as a starting point for the verbal definition or description of it. The method of measuring time, as on the sun-dial, with reference to the sun's apparent motion, is sufficiently obvious. That midday was thought of as the time when the sun was in mid heaven appears from Josh. x. 13: "So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven (בחצי השמים), and hasted not to go down about a whole day." The force of the contrast in "I will make the sun set at *noon*" (Amos viii. 9), depends upon the fact that the

[1] But see note 1, p. 310.

[2] The latter as a *nomen unitatis* seems to denote the *moment* when the sun has culminated. The former is probably less definite.

sun is then farthest from setting. Compare Jer. vi. 4, where noon is regarded as the turning point of the day. And indeed the Hebrews *must* have had an idea of *mid*day[1] as they had of midnight; although we do not actually find חצי היום corresponding to חצי הלילה. The Arabs use نصف for the *middle* of both day and night. Lastly, if צָהֳרַיִם properly denotes midday with reference to a dividing point[2], rather than to a *maximum* intensity of light, it is easy to see how the same root might come to be applied, as in Syriac[3] (see Castell), to denote midnight as well as midday.

יִצְהָר] From this word for "oil" it is usually thought that the verb צהר is derived, but the form of the substantive seems rather to indicate that it comes itself from the verb: so Fürst takes it, making צהר mean *to shine*. But there is no evidence to prove that the verb means this; nor is the sequence of ideas, (1) *to shine*, (2) *that which shines*, viz. oil, entirely satisfactory. It would perhaps be more natural to suppose צהר to mean *press*, or somehow to denote a process of making oil, and thence to deduce "oil," as being *succus expressus*.

In favour of the conjecture that יִצְהָר may properly denote a *succus expressus*, is its meaning "oil *fresh from the press*." So Gesenius: "*Oleum*, idque recens et hornum (quo differt a שֶׁמֶן ut mustum a vino), a splendore pellucido dictum (cf. זָהָב Zach. iv. 12). Kimchi: נקרא השמן כן בעת חידושו אחר הדריכה." But if יִצְהָר means properly oil fresh from the דריכה or treading, in contrast with שמן, its characteristic would not, I suppose, be brightness: on the other hand, it is not unlikely, *a priori*, that its name would contain a reference to the process of its manufacture, and this favours the view that the true sequence is (1) *press*, (2) *succus expressus*. There is

[1] Compare *μεσημβρία*, and *meridies* (as usually explained), *mittag*, *midi*, *mezzogiorno*. The Persian for noon is *nîm roz*, half-day, as Mr Palmer informs me. See too on טהר, § IV.

[2] Whether being that point, or including it.

[3] ܨܗܪܐ is used for *midday*, and ܨܗܪܐ ܕܠܠܝܐ for *midnight*.

no doubt that יִצְהָר does properly denote new oil, and that it "sæpissime conjungitur cum תִּירוֹשׁ musto." This meaning is brought out by such passages as: "All the best of the oil, and all the best of the wine, and of the wheat, the first fruits of them which they shall offer unto the LORD, them have I given thee. [And] whatsoever is first ripe in the land, which they shall bring unto the LORD, shall be thine," (Numb. xviii. 12, 13); "That thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil," Deut. xi. 14; xii. 17; xiv. 23; 2 Chron. xxxi. 5; Hos. ii. 22; Joel i. 10; ii. 24; Hag. i. 11. In Mic. vi. 15, יִצְהָר may be said to be understood: "Thou shalt sow, but thou shalt not reap; thou shalt tread the olives [and produce יצהר], but thou shalt not anoint thee with שמן; and תירוש, but shalt not drink יין." As יין is refined תירוש, so שמן is refined יצהר, and the idea of brightness is not specially appropriate in the latter although at first sight Zech. iv. 11—14 may seem to favour the received derivation: "Then answered I, and said unto him, What are these two olive-trees upon the right side of the candlestick and upon the left side thereof? And I answered again, and said unto him, What be these two olive-branches which through the two golden pipes (צַנְתְּרוֹת) empty the golden oil [lit. *the gold*] out of themselves? And he answered me and said, Knowest thou not what these be? And I said, No, my lord. Then said he, These are the two anointed ones (בְּנֵי הַיִּצְהָר) that stand by the LORD of the whole earth."

From this passage it is argued, that since the יצהר is alluded to as a golden stream, lit. *gold*, therefore brightness and transparency enter etymologically in the word יצהר. But it is not quite evident that what is described as "gold" is really יצהר.

1. With the description of the candlestick (remarks Rosenmüller) should be compared Ex. xxv. 31 sq., which relates to the golden candlestick of the tabernacle: this candlestick was provided not with יצהר but with שמן (Ex. xxv. 6; xxxv. 8, 14, 28; Lev. xxiv. 2; Numb. iv. 16): hence the lamps in Zech. iv. are to be thought of as fed with שמן and not יצהר.

2. The latter word is used however in ver. 14. How is this to be accounted for? Simply by the symbolism of the passage. The word יצהר is required because the oil is represented as new oil, coming directly from the tree. "Non dubium est (writes Rosenmüller on צנתרות) interpretes illos intellexisse *effusoria* seu *epistomia* vasis alicujus, ex quo liquor effluit, hic quidem epistomia lacus torcularis, oleum calcatum effundentia. Aben Ezra צנתרות *vasa* esse ait *in quibus calcantur olivæ*... In vv. 2, 3, describitur principium et causa olei, et in vv. 12, 13, 14 subjecta quæ ab eo succum ducunt (*Gussetius*)." Now if the oil is represented as *oleum calcatum*, and if יצהר means *oleum calcatum*, this is the word which must be used even if the "oil" is really שמן. This passage then is no proof that יִצְהָר means *shining* oil, nor does it appear that there is any other passage which can be adduced to prove it.

יַצְהִירוּ] This verb occurs once, viz. in the hiphil, in Job xxiv. 11:

בין שורתם יצהירו
יקבים דרכו ויצמאו׃

The view commonly received is that יצהירו means *to make oil*, from יצהר *oil;* but, as above remarked, the noun, to judge from its form, seems rather to have been derived from the verb. In order to satisfy the requirements of the verse itself, it is sufficient to make the verb mean generally, *to work the press*, and not specially, *to make oil:* the particular meaning *oil* might none the less be appropriated to the derivative יצהר. A comparison of vv. 6, 10, 11, in some degree confirms the conjecture that in ver. 11 there is no reference to oil. "*In the field they must reap his* (the wicked man's) *grain, and gather* the produce of *the wicked man's* vineyard, (ver. 6).... *They* (that is the poor) *go about naked, without clothing, and hungry* are they, when *they carry the sheaves.* The wicked man's sheaves (ver. 10).... *They press out oil* (?) *within their* (the wicked men's) *walls; they tread* their *wine presses, and* yet *suffer thirst* (ver. 11)." See Bernard's Job. Here ver. 6 describes the out-door

work of the field and the vineyard; ver. 10 the carrying the sheaves within doors; ver. 11 the treading of the grapes "between their walls." The labourers are described as hungry in ver. 10, and as thirsty in ver. 11. There would seem to be no reason for superadding the idea of *oil* making, *unless* the word יצהירו of itself implies this[1]. If we refer ver. 11 wholly to the work of *wine* making, the parallelism between ver. 10, 11, and the two hemistichs of ver. 6 becomes more complete; and be it remarked that various parts of the book of Job are found to correspond in this exact way. But however this may be, if we can obtain for the verb יצהירו some such meaning as *calcare*, we may satisfy the obvious requirements of Job xxiv. 11, and also deduce the word for "oil," as being that which is pressed out or exudes. Now from *dorsum* or *uppermost surface*, we actually deduce in Arabic (vid. on ظهر), to *mount* or *be upon the surface* of a thing, and hence we might derive *calcare*. Some such meaning as this being appropriated to the hiphil or causative conjugation, the kal might mean intransitively *stillare;* whence יִצְהָר, *that which exudes*, viz. oil. The special meaning comes without difficulty: not dissimilarly דרך is used absolutely [of grape treading] without an object expressed, in Judg. ix. 27; Jer. xxv. 30.

III. *On the Arabic root* ظهر.

We have next to consider the argument from the Arabic; and it will appear as regards the comparison of צהר with ظهر the Hebrew lexicons (Gesenius, Fürst, &c.) are simply misled-

[1] It is objected that if הצהיר applies to wine as well as to oil, יצהר might as well mean *wine* as *oil*. I think that by force of usage the noun *may* have become specialized independently of the verb, but I have gone further than was necessary for my present purpose in suggesting that הצהיר may refer not specially to oil. I am only concerned to shew that the sequence (1) *press*, (2) *oil* is in every way as natural *a priori* as (1) *oil*, (2) *press*. It remains however that the received meaning of the verb is inferred not from its context, but from a noun (itself deverbal in form) which occurs elsewhere.

ing. They leave the student with the impression that the comparison favours the assumed root meaning *light*, when in fact it goes decidedly against it. Under ظهر we find a great variety of meanings which come at once from the idea *dorsum*, or *uppermost surface*. For such meanings see Castell, Freytag, &c.; or for a more complete list see the *Muhít el Muhít*, written in Arabic, by Bustání, large edition, Beyrout. We find such meanings as *to spurn*, cast behind one's back, *to mount* or be on the back or top of anything, (e. g. a house), *a stirrup*, as used in mounting, *to recite memoriter*, sc. on the back or "tip" of one's tongue, *to ticket* a thing writing its price on the back of it, &c. &c. We have also the meaning NOON, from the sun's culmination[1], and various other meanings of which the origin is sufficiently obvious. It may be well to consider more at length the particular class of meanings adduced in the Hebrew lexicons. To explain the meanings *prodiit*, *manifestavit*, and the like, it is altogether unnecessary to go out of the way and assume a new root meaning "splendour." We only want the idea of externality, which the lexicons give plainly enough; thus Freytag (and see Castell),

"ظَاهِرٌ Apparens, conspicuus, externus.

ظَاهِرًا Extrinsecus et manifeste."

If ظهر means *back* or *surface*, as it actually does, and if it is constantly opposed, as it is, to بطن (Heb. בֶּטֶן, *belly*), we get at once the contrast, *externus*, *internus* (used of *sin*, of meanings *of the Qorán*, &c. &c.), بطن applying to that which is shut up, inclosed, and therefore obscure, secret, profound, while ظهر applies to that which is on the surface, outside, and therefore *manifest*, or to what is literally "superficial." The same contrast has a variety of simply physical applications: ظهر and بطن are used of the *high* and the *low* parts of a wady, i. e. of the raised sides and of the بَطْحٌ, or gravelly part where the water flows or per-

[1] See *p. s.* page 312.

colates: also of the *outside* of a garment in contrast with the *lining;* of the two sides of a *quill;* of the *hand,* &c. &c. In conjunction (like Alpha and Omega) the words imply totality, being used of God. These applications are easily explained if ظهر means simply *outside,* but if it meant *bright*[1], *splendid,* it would not contrast so symmetrically with بطن. We may conclude then that the meanings *manifestus fuit, manifestavit* do not at all favour the assumed meaning *splenduit.* In these as in its other applications the root is pervaded by the meaning DORSUM.

I may add that Mr Palmer considers this to be a fair statement of the case.

It must now be asked whether צהר and ظهر are really to be identified. We have seen that both parties agree in the identification—Gesenius and Fürst endeavouring to support by it their meaning "splenduit," and Schultens quoting ظهر, *dorsum.* Now there is an affinity between the letters צ, ט, so that the words are related in form[2]: they have also in common the strong permanent meaning NOON. The Arabic form moreover appears in the Chaldee, where it is allowed to be related to צהר. Thus Buxtorf:—

"טְיַהֲרָא, טִיהַר *Meridies, Medium diei.* Derivatur ex Hebræo צהר et צהרים, commutatis ט et צ, ut fieri solet."

There is also in Syriac ܛܗܪ, and in Samaritan the connecting form טהרים. There seems then to be good reason for identifying ظهر and צהר; and we have seen that the all-pervading sense in the former is DORSUM.

IV. *On the Chaldee* טְהַר, "*Medium?*"

Buxtorf gives "medium" as a meaning of טְהַר; and if this were correct it would be natural to *derive* טיהר in accordance

[1] See *p. s.* page 313.

[2] The singular of צהרים agrees even in vocalization with ظهر, as *e.g.* does אזן with اذن.

with its explanation sc. *meridies, medium diei*[1]. But see Buxtorf s. v., and on the other side Levy. Not to enter upon a long discussion of this point, I remark in passing that the saying quoted by R. bar Shila in the Gemara, טהר טידרא והוי פלגיה דיומא, *when the "noon" shines it is the middle of the day,* testifies to the fact that טידר was actually conceived of as midday, whether or not it meant etymologically midday.

V. *On* טהר, *to purify.*

Under the Chaldee root טהר we find the meanings, *Purgatio, nitor, aqualiculus in balneo; Medium*[2], *meridies.* But since ט stands for the two Arabic letters ط, ظ, it naturally occurs to us that the meanings of two distinct roots may have been here united under the one form טהר. The Arabic طهر, means, *purgatio,* &c., and ظهر means *dorsum, meridies,* &c. When we go to the Hebrew these roots diverge still further, for we find טהר, *purgatio,* and צהרים, *meridies;* and the forms טהר, צהר are not so strikingly similar as to make it seem necessary that we should identify them. It appears rather that in their later forms they have *converged,* and thus they may have come to be regarded as more closely allied than they in fact are: nor is it difficult to see how this convergence may have been effected, for (1) as regards form, צ often passes into ט in Chaldee, and (2) from "*meridies*" and also from "*purificatio*" may be derived the meaning *brightness;* and thus, both in form and meaning, צהר and טהר might approximate. The next step is to reverse this process, and assume that they have

[1] If צהר meant *medium,* we might suppose צהרי־יום (=חצי היום, correlative to חצי הלילה) to become contracted into a spurious dual form צָהֳרַיִם. So with שָׁחֳרַיִם, עַרְבַּיִם. In Prov. vii. 9, עֶרֶב־יוֹם actually occurs. But a more probable explanation of the dual form is the following. Suppose the two slopes of the sky, from the place of sunrise to the zenith, and from the zenith to the place of sunset, divided into a certain number of parts: then the time during which the sun traverses the two highest parts, one of each slope, constitutes the צהרים, or *two noons.*

[2] But this doubtful. See § IV.

diverged from a primal "splendor." I do not then see any absolute necessity for shewing an organic connexion between these roots. The argument for making צָהֳרַיִם mean properly *midday*, פלגיה דיומא, and for making צהר mean ظهر, *dorsum*, has, I think, considerable force independently of any attempts to explain the other applications of the root צהר, or to connect it with the Hebrew טהר. I venture however to suggest a way of establishing a remote connexion between the two roots. I am not convinced that "*nitor*" is a primary meaning of טהר. The predominant application of the word in the various dialects is apparently to some process of purification, perhaps *washing* [But see P.S.]. Now יצהר is applied to a certain fluid, viz. *oil*: there is no good reason to suppose oil so named from "brightness," while on the other hand, to speak generally, there is no difficulty in supposing it to have come from *stillare*, however that may have been arrived at. Now if צהר could mean *stillare*, we might pass therefrom to טהר, *wash, cleanse*, just as we pass in Arabic from نطف *stillavit*, to نظف *mundus fuit*.

P.S. I add various passing suggestions and remarkable combinations of meanings under single roots, which may be worth considering in themselves, or may serve as illustrations of what has been said in the course of this article.

טהור, strictly *cleansed*, is the proper antithesis of טמא, "quod immersum est in lutum, inde pollutum et contaminatum:" so Gesenius s. v. which he refers to טמן *abscondit*: an antithesis of this is in ظهر *externus fuit*, whence might come ظهر. Or طهر *purge*, "purus, mundus fuit, spec. a menstruis [طمث] Cor. 2. 222," might be related to the common *sensus obscœnus* of ظهر. This seems not altogether improbable. In the Bible טהר seems to mean properly *purgation*. Compare דמי טהרה Lev. xii. 4, 5: the "purgation" itself constitutes in the first instance the defilement. From purgation, applied to metals, &c., we then get the idea *nitor*, which however is only occasionally appropriate; the predominant Biblical meaning of טהר being *κάθαρσις* or the like.

Or again, for the sequence *dorsum, oil*[1]—in nature the facts of *fluidity* and *declivity* go together: hence we might expect that in language the corresponding ideas would go together. Accordingly under one root, viz. صعد, we find (in Freytag): "Ascendit, descendit, liquefecit, sublimavit, suprema pars montis difficilior ascensu, superficies terræ." Compare ضهر, صهر, *liquavit, fastigium montis*[2].

Or, again, יצהר might mean, that which rises to or is skimmed from the *surface*, like cream, as opposed to sediment. Or from the idea of two slopes running up into a ridge (*dorsum*) might come (1) *contraction*, (2) *compression*, &c. &c.

p. s. For the ancient names of the divisions of day and night[3] Mr Palmer refers to the following verses by Nasíf el Yázijí, *Majmá el Bahrein* (Beyrout), p. 35:

اول ساعة من النهار هى البكور والبزوغ طار

والرأد والضحى المتوع بعد ظهيرة ثم الزوال عدوا

ثم الاصيل العصر ثم الطفل وبالحدور والغروب تكمل

Now متوع is explained as "being *high*[4], not yet begun to decline": زوال means *declension:* and between these comes ظهيرة, which I understand of the moment at which the sun has *culminated*, and is at the point of descending. The reference to *ascent* may be dubious in the earlier رأد[5]; but of the later hours one is named from اصل, *root*, while حدر means, *to descend*. Thus we see that there is a distinct reference to *height* or *depth*

[1] Compare دهن, "*oleum* quo ungitur, pluvia levior *superficiem* modo terræ humectans:" χρίω, "strictly *to touch the surface of a body slightly*... hence *to rub, anoint with scented unguents* or *oil*."

[2] And see هضب.

[3] As comparatively modern authorities compare the list of treatises marked R. 13. 16, in the *Trinity College* Catalogue of Arabic, Persian and Turkish MSS. Here we find elaborate directions for determining the hour of the day by observations of the sun.

[4] Freytag begins with *Altus fuit.*

[5] Freytag begins with, *emicuit elataque fuit* illustrior diei pars.

in times other than ظهيرة; and we know independently that the root ظهر is frequently used in the sense *mount, be on the top of,* being explained by على repeatedly in the *Muhít el Muhít.*

p. s. If ظهر and بطن denote respectively *outside* and *inside,* it is of course conceivable that the latter word might chance to represent the *bright* part. If this were found to be the case we should have a striking argument against the view that ظهر means radically *bright.* Now an example very much to the point occurs on p. 170 of Kosegarten's *Arabic Chrestomathy,* where in the description of a certain flower the بطن is brighter than the ظهر.

The Curse of Canaan. Gen. ix. 25—27.

"And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him. And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, Blessed be the LORD God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant."

The great controversy is about the subject of the verb *dwell.* Is Japheth to dwell in the tents of Shem? or is God to dwell in the tents of Shem? If the latter meaning were adopted, and it were desired to avoid ambiguity, it would be well to omit the pronoun and read, "God shall enlarge Japheth and dwell in the tents of Shem." The English Bible rendering has the advantage in this particular of embracing the two possible translations of the Hebrew. When however we come to the second clause of the same verse we find the text favours the former alternative by reading in the singular, "Canaan shall be *his* servant," which evidently means *Japheth's,* while in the preceding verse "*his*" means *Shem's.* In the margin however we find, in more palpable agreement with the Hebrew, "Canaan shall be *their* servant" (ver. 26, 27). The Hebrew word is לָמוֹ, whereof the ordinary rendering is, *to them;* some

absolutely reject the singular rendering and all agree that it would be at least exceptional. This being the case, the singular rendering ought to be expelled from the *text*, unless the meaning of the passage is on the whole clear enough to force upon us a very exceptional usage of a common word.

The Hebrew of vv. 25—27, is as follows:

ויאמר ארור כנען
עבד עבדים יהיה לאחיו׃
ויאמר ברוך יהוה אלהי שם
ויהי כנען עבד למו׃
יפת אלהים ליפת וישכן באהלי שם
ויהי כנען עבד למו׃

First consider the last verse by itself. If this could be conceived of as entirely isolated, we should not hesitate to take the למו as a plural referring to the two individuals mentioned in the preceding hemistich. Japheth and Shem having been mentioned, it is added that Canaan should be a servant to *them*, viz. to Japheth and Shem. It would neither occur to us to make למו a singular, nor to conceive of "Shem" and "Japheth" as used collectively for the Shemites and the Japhethites[1].

Next take ver. 25 in connexion with ver. 27. In the one Canaan is cursed and assigned as a slave to his brethren: in the other, Japheth and Shem being mentioned, it is said that Canaan shall be their slave. In these verses, taken apart from ver. 26, it would seem obvious that the two second hemistichs were substantially identical, the clause "Canaan shall be their servant" being simply a modified expression of, "a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren."

Thirdly let ver. 26 be introduced, the words אלהי שם being for the present omitted. Then, giving to the ו an asse-

[1] Even if we say (*Keil &c.*) that למו though grammatically singular is exegetically collective or plural, we allow that the singular is required in a *translation* as opposed to a paraphrase.

verative force, we should have simply an ascription of praise to Jehovah, with a reiteration of the curse of Canaan,

> Yea, blessed be Jehovah,
> Canaan shall be their servant.

The blessing then follows in ver. 27.

Lastly, we have to ask if there is anything in the words *God of Shem*, which have yet to be taken into account, to disturb the above general arrangement of the passage. On the contrary it might be urged that they rather confirm it, if we suppose that in ver. 27 Shem is blessed as well as Japheth. There is a rather striking coincidence which seems not to have been noticed, but which would at once account for the proleptic mention of Shem and for the particular form assumed by what I take to be the blessing of Shem, ישכן באהלי שם, God *shall dwell in the tents of Shem*.

In certain classes of oracular sayings in the Hebrew Scriptures it is well known that there is a strong bias in favour of *paronomasia*. A play upon words is seldom missed when it suggests itself at all naturally, so that very frequently the form of a blessing, for example, is determined by the name of the person blessed. In the case before us there is such a connexion between the name of Japheth and his blessing יַפְתְּ אלהים לְיֶפֶת, but it does not at first sight appear that there is anything at all analogous to this in the case of Shem. Led doubtless by a right instinct some have attempted in a way to supply the deficiency by rendering אהלי שם, *tents of* RENOWN. But this gives only a distorted *paronomasia*, for it involves a play on the name of Shem with reference to Japheth. This solution must be rejected, but there is another which seems to have been passed over, and which gives symmetry to the utterance of Noah by supplying a direct *paronomasia* with reference to Shem. The expressions *God of Shem* and *tents of Shem* consist of the same letters, the order only of two adjacent letters in the one being inverted in the other; and this literal identity of the two expressions, viz.

אלהי שם
אהלי שם

may fairly predispose us to conjecture that they are to be connected exegetically. It is strictly in accordance with Biblical usage elsewhere to draw such an inference: in this very passage *paronomasia* is employed with reference to Japheth: and there is a peculiar fitness in saying that One who is emphatically described as the *God of Shem*, should be thought of as dwelling in *the tents of Shem*. May it not be said that, regard being had to well authenticated usage, the marked literal agreement which I have pointed out would in all probability have been made use of unless (to introduce a not very probable supposition) *it had altogether escaped notice?* It seems far from unnatural to suppose that, the name Shem being in itself less suggestive, the expression *God of Shem* was introduced to lead up to the form assumed by the blessing of Shem. The whole passage now becomes symmetrical. The curse of Canaan is the burden of the song, coming in at the end of each verse like the refrain of Ps. cxxxvi., "for his mercy endureth for ever." Shem and Japheth have each a direct blessing, whereas the more usual renderings give to Shem only the indirect blessing implied by the fact that Jehovah, to whom blessing is ascribed, is called the God of Shem. And, moreover, as there is here a symmetry of substance so there is also a symmetry of form, since in each case the medium of *paronomasia* is used. As regards authorities: "the Targum of Onkelos interprets the Hebrew by making אלהים the subject of ישכן, and renders it paraphrastically וישרי שכנתה במשכנה דשם. His Shekinah shall dwell in the dwelling of Shem (or of the Name). Maimonides, Rashi, and Aben Ezra, all follow this, though they also allude to a secondary sense: that Japheth should learn in the schools of Shem, which is also expressed in the Targum of Jonathan. So the Judaico-Arabic interpretation of Arabs Erpenianus. The interpretation, too, must have been very ancient, antecedent to Targums and Talmuds, as it seems to have coloured everywhere the poetry and language of the Old Testament. Hence that frequent imagery of God's *dwelling* with his people, or the converse in expression, though essentially the same in thought, his being his people's "dwelling place to all generations." See 1 Kings vi. 13, viii. 29; Exod. xxv. 8; Ps. xc. 1; Ezek. xliii. 9;

Zech. viii. 3." See for the above, and for further judicious remarks in favour of this interpretation, a note by Professor Tayler Lewis in the English Edition of Lange's Genesis.

The Vision of Hœgar. Gen. xvi. 13, 14.

"And she called the name of the LORD that spake unto her, *Thou God seest me:* for she said, *Have I also here looked after him that seeth me?* Wherefore the well was called *Beer-lahai-roi.*"

We have to discuss,

(i) אתה אל רְאִי

(ii) הגם הלם ראיתי אחרי רֹאִי

(iii) באר לַחַי רֹאִי :

(i) means, *Thou art a God of seeing;* i.e. either, a God who sees, or a God who is seen. If the former, the Authorised Version rendering may serve as a paraphrase: in illustration compare Gen. xxii. 14, "And Abraham called the name of that place יהוה יראה." The following רֹאִי can only mean *my seer,* or *one seeing me,* and this seems to turn the scale in favour of the active meaning of רְאִי.

(ii) This clause is literally rendered in the Authorized Version. The accentuation shows that רֹאִי is a participle with an affix of the first person. She calls God a God of providence as being one who saw and watched over her though she had not looked to Him. The only difficulty is in the combination ראה אחרי[1], which I think does not recur. But,

[1] Compare רָאָה אֶל (Is. xvii. 7). אַחֲרֵי would be preferred because of the assonance אחרי ראי, חי ראי. Or perhaps the idea may be that of looking *after* as in following a leader. See Gesen. *Thesaur.* 843. a, on Gen. xix. 26. "Dei providentiam (writes *Vatablus*) nunc agnoscere incipit; quum prius sibi visa esset fortuito raptari per desertum, nunc sentit ac fatetur Divinitus gubernari res humanas." An-

"to look *after*," is natural enough in itself, and we may illustrate it not unsatisfactorily from Ezek. xx. 24: "And their eyes *were after*, הָיוּ אַחֲרֵי, their fathers' idols."

(iii) The meaning of this, as it stands, is plainly, The well of (or *to*) the living one who sees me[1]. The foregoing interpretation is now commonly abandoned; it being assumed that the feeling of Hagar must have been that expressed in Judg. xiii. 22[2]: "We shall surely die because we have seen God." But against the inference see the remarks of Lange *in loc.* At any rate it is not obvious from the context *a priori;* and it is found, when the words are considered in detail, to involve *an alteration of the text,* although its advocates are not all of them aware of this[3].

Subjoined is an extract from the commentary of Kalisch: "*Do I even still see after seeing?* although I saw thee, I still live and see the light of day. 1. רָאִי is evidently the same form which רֹאִי is *in pausa,* just as צָרֵי become in pause צָרֹי, Ezek. xxvii. 17. 2. רָאִי or רֹאִי cannot be translated he *sees me,* for this would require רֹאֵנִי. 3. It signifies *vision* or *sight,* (comp. 1 Sam. xvi. 12; Job xxiii. 21). 4. גַּם not only adds emphasis to the word to which it refers, but introduces a new and stronger notion, and often one of surprise, and is therefore here to be translated *even* (as in Prov. xiv. 20; Eccl. x. 20; Ps. xiv. 3). 5. הֲלֹם is in this concise passage used instead of עַד הֲלֹם (2 Sam. vii. 18), with which it is in fact always identical in sense; for הֲלֹם is not *here* but *hither,* and is only used after verbs of motion (Exod. iii. 5; Judg. xviii. 3; Ruth ii. 4, etc.); and it signifies, therefore, here, hitherto, to

other opinion is that she knew the angel to be an angel because he vanished mysteriously so that she could not *follow him with her eyes.* See Gesen. on הביט אחרי. For the Vulgate compare Ex. xxxiii. 23.

[1] See Fürst s. v. חַי.

[2] Compare on the other side Gen. xxi. 17 where the voice brings comfort and not fear.

[3] Fürst, Keil, &c. notice it and propose to move the accent. My attention was called to the point by Mr Mason when I first read the passage.

this moment, or *still*. 6. רָאָה is, like the Greek ὁράω, used instead of ראה שמש (Eccl. vi. 5; vii. 11), or ראה אוד (Ps. xlix. 20; Lat. *diem videre*), and signifies, therefore, *to live*.... "She called the well, *the fountain of the life of beholding*."

The foregoing will not bear examination:

1. To say that רָאִי is the pause form of רֹאִי is erroneous. The form would be רֹאִי[1]. Dr Kalisch, be it observed, prints the text with the accents at the end of his commentary.

2. To say that רֹאִי cannot be rendered as a participle[2] would be to make a second mistake, independent of accentuation. Compare e.g. Job vii. 8: "The eye of *him that hath seen me* (רֹאִי) shall see me no more."

5. If הלם is always used with verbs which themselves imply direction, it is unnecessary for הלם to imply more than locality. The like might be inferred from the use of the combination עד הלם. But suppose it proved that הלם means *hither:* this is not a sufficient reason for rendering it *still*. הלם, to one at a distance from the spot indicated, may in effect mean *hither*, but only in the same way that our "here" in like circumstances amounts to *hither*. הלם elsewhere designates *locality*, but it is by some applied to time in 2 Sam. vii. 18: "Who am I, O LORD God? and what is my house, that thou hast brought me hitherto, עד הלם?" Here, however, the meaning may be *thus far*, to this pitch of greatness.

6. It is foreign to Hebrew usage that ראה should mean live. We can no more infer from ראה חיים (Eccl. ix. 9), and the like, that ראה alone means *to live*, than we can infer from

[1] 1 Sam. xvi. 12; Job xxxiii. 21.

[2] What if שלחי (2 Sam. xxiv. 13) is to be translated in strict accuracy *my sender?* It amounts clearly to שלחני *one sending me*. But the universality even of this sort of distinction may be called in question. It is not clear that the participle loses its proper verb-power in כל מצאי (Gen. iv. 14). In the text I have quoted Job vii. 8, because it contains the very word under discussion; but, examples from other verbs being equally appropriate, the general argument would not be affected if it could be proved that the pointing of Job vii. 8 is not to be relied upon.

רְאֵה מוּת (Ps. lxxxix. 49) that it means *to die.* Nor can we well argue from a not very old use of *ὁρᾶν* to early Hebrew. Again, the past tense רְאִיתִי is unsuitable to such a phrase as, "Do I still live?" Moreover, it seems to me that making רְאֵה mean "live," neutralizes the evident play upon the idea of simple "vision." This difficulty has been felt by some advocates of the lately adopted meaning of רְאֵה, who have felt constrained to drag into the words "God of seeing," the complex meaning, "A God, who being *seen*, those who see him remain *alive*." Lange mentions this as the view of Hengstenberg and Tuch.

Lastly, those who render בְּאֵר לַחַי רֹאִי in the way approved by Dr Kalisch, should at least explain their construction of the words. They assume that רֹאִי is a substantive, (either changing or not noticing the position of the accent); but do they take it *in regimine* with חַי, to which the article is prefixed? Even if we suppose חַי and רֹאִי to be both nouns, we should still expect the qualifying noun to be that which stands in the second place, so that חַי רֹאִי would mean *a life attended with vision*, rather than *a vision attended with life*, i. e. which one sees without dying. But if we translate the received Masoretic text, רֹאִי must mean *one who sees me*, and it is then not easy to make לַחַי mean anything else than *to the living one.* The change of an accent is a small matter, but here it seems to increase our difficulties. To conclude with a two-edged remark of Kalisch: "If the Hebrew phrase should be deemed obscure or elliptical it may be remembered that it is intended as the etymological explanation of a name; and that in such cases the choice of words depends on the latitude which the name affords."

P. S. Rosenmüller sums up: "Qui omnes tamen videntur in eo errasse, quod רֹאִי ceperunt vel pro אֲנִי רֹאֶה, vel pro רֹאֶה אוֹתִי, quum tamen vix dubium sit esse idem quod proxime præcessit nomen רֳאִי, mutato tantum, *propter pausam*, Schva compositio, in analogam vocalem longam." This suggests an addi-

tional argument against the view which Rosenmüller, Kalisch, &c. defend. It happens that רְאִי is just as much *in pause* as רְאִי (ver. 13), and רְאִי (ver. 14). Now why does not רְאִי assume the pause form as we should expect it would do? It stands anomalously in pause but not in its pause form: may not this be designed to *distinguish it* the more plainly from רְאִי, with which, in an unaccented copy, it would otherwise coincide in form?

Sarah and Abimelech. Gen. xx. 16.

The words of Abimelech to Sarah have been variously explained; but of the interpretations which have been proposed none can be said to be thoroughly satisfactory, while some may be fairly characterized as extravagant. The Authorized Version is open to the *a priori* objection that it disregards the punctuation of the original. It also turns the disputed words of Abimelech into a reproof of Sarah, when the context would perhaps rather lead us to expect that his tone to her would be apologetic, although in ver. 10 he naturally expostulates with Abraham: "What hast thou done unto us? and what have I offended thee, &c."

The disputed passage is, in the original,

(1) הנה נתתי אלף כסף לאחיך

(2) הנה הוא לך כסות עינים לכל אשר אִתָּךְ

(3) ואת כל וְנֹכָחַת׃

(1) Of these three clauses the first is clear; we have only to notice the emphasis on אחיך. Abraham had been described to Abimelech as Sarah's brother, and Abimelech now alludes to him *qua* brother, and as one who had represented himself as such.

(2) הוא] not *it*, viz. the thousand pieces of silver, but, as above, *he*, thy brother: Abraham, *qua* brother of Sarah: Abraham, as having been so described to Abimelech.

כסות עינים] *a covering of eyes.* To cover the eyes is to take away the power of seeing: and to "cover" them, metaphorically, with reference to any particular matter, is to take away the power of seeing or understanding the truth of that matter. Thus in Is. xxix. 10, 11, prophetic vision is taken away: "The LORD hath closed your eyes...the seers *hath He covered.* And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed." In Gen. xx. 16, I take the covering of eyes with reference to Abraham's deception as regards Sarah, *i.e.* to his attempt to keep others in ignorance of her actual relationship to him.

אתך] *with thee.* Abraham by representing himself as her brother becomes a covering of eyes (or, as we might say, A BLIND) to all that are *with* her, *i.e.* to all strangers who may associate with her or be in her company.

ואת כל] *but with any, i.e.* in the presence of any, or with whomsoever thou mayest associate.

ונכחת] *thou wilt be recognized,* sc. despite his attempts at concealing thy true *status.* As in Gen. xxx. 15 we find וְלָקַחַתְ for וְלָקַחְתָּ, so here we have וְנָכַחַתְ for וְנָכַחְתָּ, the regular form of the 2 pers. fem. past niphal from יכח, with a ו prefixed, which is here, as it is said, "mere conversiva." The word יכח signifies indeed in suitable contexts (though only secondarily) *to reprove,* but here probably, as many take it, its meaning is *to point out clearly.* Compare Gen. xxiv. 44: "Let the same be the woman whom the LORD hath appointed out for my master's son," where the Hebrew is אשר הכיח יהוה לבן אדני.

The meaning of the whole would thus be:—"Behold I have given a thousand pieces of silver to thy brother: behold, he may be for thee a covering of eyes to any that are with thee; but with any thou wouldest be recognized,"—*i.e.* although Abraham, represented as thy brother, may serve thee for (or attempt to make himself) a covering of eyes (="*a blind*") to any persons who may chance to associate with thee, yet in the company of any persons whatsoever thou canst not fail to be recognized: thy true *status* as the wife of so great a man

and a prophet (ver. 7) must be recognized, though God himself should have to interpose in thy behalf.

This would make the address of Abimelech to Sarah complimentary and consolatory, as we might expect it to be, for his ground of complaint would be against Abraham alone, and he would regard Sarah as one who had suffered wrong through acting under her husband's directions.

The Blessing of Esau. Gen. xxvii. 39, 40.

"Behold, the dwelling shall be *the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above;* and by thy sword thou shalt live, and shalt serve thy brother; *and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion,* that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck."

(1) In the blessing of Jacob (ver. 28) the same expressions מטל השמים and משמני הארץ had been used. It is said that they must be taken differently in ver. 28 and ver. 30: in the one partitively (*of* the dew, &c.), in the other privatively (*without* the dew, &c.). But the latter rendering is at least anomalous grammatically; nor is it a conclusive argument that "every blessing had already been given away to Jacob; not dominion only, but also fertility and abundance had been granted to him; and, therefore, nothing was reserved or left for Esau" (Kalisch). Jacob was indeed to possess a rich portion of the earth, but it does not follow that there was no rich portion left which might fall to the lot of Esau. The following contrast may be intended. Jacob was to settle in and *cultivate* a rich country (cp. *corn* and *wine*): Esau was to live a roving life in a rich uncultivated country, supporting himself "by his sword." This difference corresponds to the difference of their dispositions.

(2) The words

והיה כאשר תריד ופרקת וג׳

present considerable difficulty. The Authorised Version rendering is unsatisfactory in itself: so too is the rendering which

merely substitutes *wander freely* for *have dominion*. It is perhaps the construction which has need to be reconsidered. On the word רוד Kalisch writes that it "denotes the wild attempts of an untameable animal to break through every restraint, and revel in unchecked liberty: taken in a figurative sense, it describes, therefore, well the incessant revolts and attacks of a ferocious people, eager to shake off the yoke of servitude or dependence (Hos. xii. 1; Jer. ii. 31)." In the passage under discussion רוד comes aptly before פרק, *to break off* the yoke, if it denotes the antecedent impulse, the attempt to break it off. Perhaps then we may use the word *revolt* as a rough approximation to רוד. If now we take the construction of the Vulgate: *Tempusque veniet quum excutias et solvas*, we may render very suitably to the context:

"But there shall be [a time] when thou shalt revolt, and break his yoke from off thy neck."

The Vulgate here follows the LXX. which gives as a literal rendering: *ἔσται δὲ ἡνίκα ἐὰν καθέλῃς καὶ ἐκλύσῃς τὸν ζυγὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ τραχήλου σοῦ.*

This construction is no doubt unusual, but compare Hab. i. 3: "And there are [that] raise up strife and contention, וַיְהִי ריב ומדון יִשָּׂא." Would not Job xxi. 4 run more smoothly with a like construction? ואם מדוע לא תקצר רוחי, and is there [any reason] why I should not be impatient? *i.e.* simply "why am I not to, &c." Compare Neh. v. 2—4, "there were that said (יש אשר אמרים)." Some make the יש אשר יהיה of Numb. ix. 20, *aliquando*.

The last words of Jacob. Gen. xlix.

A. "Simeon and Levi are brethren; instruments of cruelty are [in] their *habitations*. O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united: for in their anger they slew a man, and in their *self-will* they *digged down a wall*. Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce; and their wrath for it was cruel: I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel" (ver. 5—7).

We have to consider the meanings of

(i) מכרתיהם

(ii) ברצנם

(iii) עקרו שׁור

(i) "In their habitations" is clearly a wrong rendering; nor is there any point in saying, "instruments of violence are their *swords*." But to read: "their agreements or contrivances, or, better still, *their espousals* are instruments *of violence*" is to introduce a marked antithesis, and one which, with reference to chap. xxxiv, is very appropriate. For the idea of *machination*, the Arabic مكر is compared; and for that of *espousal* the Chaldee and Syriac מכר. Mendelssohn has "Werkzeuge der Gewaltthätigkeit sind ihre *Verwandtschaft*." Poole adopts the meaning *nuptial contract* "Because this best agrees with the history recorded, Gen. xxxiv, where we read that they did cover their bloody design with a pretence of an agreement and nuptial contract with the Shechemites, which was a great aggravation of their villany, that those things which to others are bonds of love and peace, were made by them instruments of cruelty."

(ii) The word רצון has commonly a good sense. Its nearest approach to a bad sense is in Neh. ix. 24 (and the like); "To treat people, ברצונם, *as they please*." This may be said to imply arbitrariness, but the idea seems rather to be that of irresponsibility. In the passage under discussion if רצון be taken in a good sense we have a continuance of the contrast already assumed. In their רצון, when they had come to terms, they committed an act of violence, עקרו שור. They used a friendly compact with the Shechemites as an opportunity against them.

(iii) As regards the application of עקרו שור. Schumann has a suggestion worth considering. "Quum videas synonymicum parallelismum sponte apparet שׁוֹר respondere antecedenti אישׁ, ita ut significet *hominem, robustum, potentem, audacem*, qualis erat Schechem, qui Dinam vi compressit et hac violentia totius cladis Sichemitarum suique ipsius auctor fuit. Cui sententiæ non video quid obstet. Homines enim ab Hebræis

nonnunquam cum tauris comparari, doceant Deut. xxxiii. 17; Ps. xxii. 13; lxviii. 31. Cfr. Homer, Iliad, ii. 480. Itaque colligimus, עִקְּרוּ שׁוֹר dici de Schechemo, quia Schimeon et Levi vires ejus circumcisione infregerunt infractumque occiderunt. Cfr. xxxiv. 24. s." The action of עקרו of course precedes that of הרגו which had been previously mentioned. Compare Job xiv. 10.

This interpretation gives a very suitable sense to the passage. It is natural to expect that the reference would be to the affair of Dinah; and the expressions used, if interpreted as above, fit in very exactly with this view.

The nuptial contract is made an instrument of violence, and advantage is taken of friendly relations (cp. רצון) to *disable* the Shechemites by inducing them to be circumcised. If it were required to express this last poetically perhaps it could not have been done better than by the phrase עקר שור, to *hamstring* (= disable) an *ox* (or collectively *oxen*). There is no trace in chap. xxxiv. of any literal hamstringing of oxen: it is merely said (ver. 28) that the cattle were taken possession of.

Lastly, this developes a pointed meaning in ver. 6. "Come not into their *secret*, &c.:" it is dangerous to enter into close agreement with them, "for they savagely slew men (lit. *a man*), when by the help of a friendly compact they had disabled them."

B. "But his bow abode in strength, and the *arms of his hands* were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob; (*from thence* is the shepherd, the stone of Israel)" (ver. 24).

(i) ויפזו זרעי ידיו

(ii) מידי אביר יעקב

מִשָּׁם רעה אבן ישראל

(i) What is meant by the "arms" of his hands? The word for arm comes from זרע, to scatter, sow, spread: "*brachium* ab expandendo dictum" (Gesen. *Thesaur.*). The arm when acting is נטויה, "stretched out" (Deut. iv. 34). Now as the arms are to the body, with reference to extension, so are the

fingers to the hands. I propose therefore to understand simply "his *fingers*" by "the arms of his hands." Strong nimble fingers are required to handle a bow; and it is said in Ps. cxliv. 1:

"Blessed be the LORD my strength, which teacheth my hands to war, and my FINGERS to fight."

(ii) If, with some, we read מְשֻׁשָׁם, we might compare Ps. xxi. 1: "the NAME of the God of Jacob defend thee."

CHARLES TAYLOR.

NOTE on Gen. vi. 16.

Mr Field has favoured us with the following note in support of the alternative rendering in this passage suggested by him, '*coved roof*.'

צֹהַר being a *ἅπαξ* λεγ., the sense of *tectum* proposed by Schultens (from the Arab. ظهر, *dorsum*) and adopted by Dathe, Rosenmüller, and others, might, perhaps be admitted as an alternative rendering. I have added the epithet *coved*, both as being suggested by the Arabic word, and also as furnishing a clue to the meaning of the next clause, "and in a cubit shalt thou finish it (the ark) above." It has not been observed that the LXX. translation, *ἐπισυνάγων ποιήσεις τὴν κιβωτόν*, also suggests the idea of *gradual contraction* of the width[1] of the ark. So Diod. Sic. XVII. 82: *Αὗται δὲ* (*αἱ κῶμαι*) *τὰς τῶν οἰκιῶν στέγας ἔχουσιν, ἐκ πλίνθων εἰς ὀξὺ συνηγμένων ἔχουσας καμάραν.* (The explanation of *ἐπισυνάγων* given by Schleusner in *Nov. Thes.* s. v. *congregans inter ædificandum animalia, et alia ad vitam sustentandam necessaria,* is quite inadmissible.) With *ἐπισυνάγων* in the sense of *bringing the two sides of the ark together,* we might perhaps compare the Arab. ﻗﺮﺏ (in II), *rem alteri propinquam effecit.*

F. FIELD.

[1] Origen (Opp. T. II. p. 60) supposes the *length* as well as the *width* of the ark to have been gradually diminished, so as to give it a pyramidal form, terminating in a square of one cubit: *ὅπερ* (*τὸ σχῆμα*) *νομίζω ὅτι πυραμοειδές ἐστιν, ἀρχόμενον μὲν ἀπὸ μήκους τριακοσίων πηχῶν, ἀπὸ δὲ πλάτους πεντήκοντα, καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς τριάκοντα τοῦ ὕψους πήχεις ἐπισυναγόμενον, ὥστε τὴν κορυφὴν γένεσθαι μήκους καὶ πλάτους πῆχυν.*

AN INTRODUCTION TO GREEK AND LATIN ETYMOLOGY. By John Peile, M.A.

All who are interested in philological studies must feel grateful to Mr Peile for undertaking to put into a practical form for English readers the results of the investigations which have been carried on for many years with such success among German scholars. Dublin has of late sent us a contribution to the same subject in the 1st volume of Mr Ferrar's *Comparative Grammar;* but, previously to this, we had no books in English which professed to give a systematic view of etymology excepting the translation of Bopp, and Dr Donaldson's *Cratylus* and *Varronianus.* Whatever may have been the merit of these books, they were not very attractive to readers, owing to their awkward arrangement and the want of good indices and tables of contents, and they are also now to some extent antiquated. With regard to Dr Donaldson in particular, though we should be loth to treat the dead lion as he has been treated by a writer in the *Academy* for *Dec.* 15, 1870, who speaks of his theories as being "as obsolete as those of judicial astrology," yet we entirely agree with Mr Peile, that "the mixture of the proven and not-proven, makes his works unfit for students of Comparative Philology[1]."

Mr Peile's book has no doubt been in part called out by the introduction into the examination for the Classical Tripos of a paper in general philology, the nature of which is determined

[1] It is to be regretted that in another passage (p. 40) we find even Mr Peile making use of the depreciatory phrase, "Dr Donaldson is enabled to see, &c." If *odium philologicum* has too often characterized the behaviour of scholars towards their living contemporaries, surely none are more bound to show courtesy and respect to the memory of those who have done good work in their day and are no longer able to defend themselves against attack or misrepresentation.

by the list of books (including the names of Curtius and Corssen) which are recommended to students. His aim he describes as being "to give nothing but what is certain: anything further would be out of place in a handbook for beginners, which is all that these lectures profess themselves to be."

It is as a handbook for beginners then that I propose to examine this book, to see how far it is adapted for a student of ordinary intelligence who comes to it with no other preparation than his Greek and Latin Grammar. As my remarks will not be always favorable to it from this point of view, I wish to preface them by saying that the book, particularly the latter portion of it, is full of valuable information for more advanced students; and that, as far as I am able to judge, the incidental discussions of unsettled questions are always fair and sensible, even where they are not conclusive. Many of the criticisms which I have to make are equally applicable to Prof. Max Müller and other philologers; and it is for this reason, no less than for the intrinsic interest and importance of Mr Peile's own work, that I have thought it worth while to examine it at some length.

Before entering into details it may be well for me to state briefly my own idea of the manner in which this subject should have been treated in a book intended for beginners. Mr Peile himself speaks of it as "a doubtful question how far the study will be beneficial to all minds;" and I think it is plain that whatever the advantage of it, there will be some counterbalancing loss in the case of those students whose time was already well employed. Probably there will be fewer 'double men,' and those who read classics only will have to cut short the time given to Homer and Plato and Tacitus, perhaps to Shakespeare and Goethe, in order to get up their Comparative Philology. Many will no doubt find the change very irksome; and for their sakes I think it would have been desirable to connect as much as possible the new branch of study with the old, and to point out this connexion from the first. With this view I think it would have been well to introduce the subject with illustrations of the four ways in which Comparative Philology aids the knowledge of what we loosely call classics, (1) by supplying a sound basis for the history and derivation of words,

(2) by explaining the various inflexions, particularly those of different dialects, (3) by showing the historical relations of Greek and Latin to each other and to the Teutonic languages, (4) by contributing to our knowledge of the prehistoric condition of the two races. Supposing the interest of the student to have been aroused by an introduction of the kind I have described, the next thing, it appears to me, should have been to give a slight sketch of the evidence on which the general science rests, and then to state exactly what definitions and axioms are assumed in the exposition which follows. Unfortunately Mr Peile has chosen to confine himself to the department of 'phonetic change,' and has thus been able only to treat incidentally of inflexions. This limitation of subject has, I think, given an air of exaggeration and one-sidedness to a good deal which he has written. Even within the sphere of phonetics his book would have been more practically useful, if it had contained a larger list of ascertained derivations, and if all of these had appeared in the index. Again there seems to me a certain want of clearness in the general arrangement: many technical terms receive no explanation; others are repeatedly used before receiving an explanation: principles are assumed not only without proof, but even without statement, until the reader who takes his first ideas on the subject out of the book itself is utterly bewildered.

I am not here giving my imagination of what might be the case, but my observation of what actually was the case with a pupil of my own whom I had recommended to read the book. Thus he was particularly puzzled by the employment of various metaphorical terms, such as *hard, light, soft, strong, heavy, weak* in reference to sound, when there had been no previous classification or arrangement of sounds, stating which should be considered to possess any of these qualities, and no definition of the meaning of the terms themselves. What added to his embarrassment was to find these distinctions insisted upon as the very key to the science of philology. "Our one sure guide," it is said in p. 8, "in etymology is never to derive a harder from an easier sound," and so in the conclusion of the book it is stated "my main object has been to point out the common reason of all these changes of

language; to convince you that they all sprang from the same desire for ease of articulation:" and, from beginning to end, the one chief source of phonetic change is asserted to be the laziness which prefers weak, light, soft sounds to the strong, heavy, and hard.

I do not of course mean to throw upon Mr Peile the responsibility of this theory, but I think he has given greater prominence to it than any one else. I do not know of any other writer who has described it as his main object to show that all phonetic change is the substitution of an easier for a harder sound, and that the cause of such change is the natural laziness of man. I confess that to me, whether this theory be true or false, it seems to be a very unimportant appendage to the science of language. For instance, I deny both parts of it: I do not think that the various laws of phonetic change can all be reduced to the one law that an easier sound is substituted for the more difficult; nor, if it were so, should I at all the more be disposed to grant that the sole psychological cause for this was laziness. Supposing my view to be wrong, if the theory is as important as Mr Peile would make it, my mistake here ought to vitiate all my conclusions as to particular etymologies. But the fact is that belief in the particular etymologies is in no degree dependent upon these hypotheses, which are presumed to account for them, but upon a vast mass of generalized observations, which are absolutely certain whether we can account for them or not. No doubt the aim of science and the tendency of the human mind is always to reduce plurality to unity, to substitute more general for less general laws: and if we can be sure that our highest generalization is capable of being universally applied, it of course furnishes a vantage-ground from which to carry on further investigations in fields as yet unexplored. But in order that it may do this, we must be sure of the universality of our principle: otherwise we fall into the error of over-simplification, which has so often proved a pitfall in the path of science.

It seems to me that if philologers, instead of imagining how phonetic changes might be produced, had noticed how they were being produced all around them, they could hardly have

persuaded themselves into the belief that "man as a speaking animal is actuated only by laziness;" a belief which I venture to call even more libellous than that which some would attribute to the Political Economists, that "man as a social animal is actuated only by self-interest." If we ask ourselves what are the causes of the differences in articulation which we hear around us, we shall find that they may be roughly classified as mental, physical and circumstantial. Under the first head would come excitability, vehemence, nervousness, preciseness, artistic sensibility, the analogical disposition always seeking after resemblances, and its opposite, which we may call the analytical disposition, always seeking after differences; under the second, dullness of hearing, defectiveness in the organs of speech; under the third, external influences so far as they act upon the other two. Thus cold diminishes our power over the organs of speech, and makes sound less distinct; one who lives much in the open air, as a country labourer, a hunter, a sailor, who has to speak loud to make himself heard, will lose the finer shades of tone which will be retained by those who live an indoor life. Again, the art of writing and the existence of a priestly caste are strongly conservative influences. Not to dwell on this, let us consider what would be the effect of natural disposition on the manner of speech. I think it will be seen that many changes which Prof. Max Müller and Mr Peile would explain from laziness are really due to an entirely opposite cause. If we compare, for instance, a vehement excitable child with one who is rather slow and precise, we shall find the one in his burst of eager volubility omitting half the unaccented vowels or syllables which drop languidly from the lips of the other. So a brisk man of business clips his words both in writing and speaking, not in the least from laziness, but to save time and spare his muscular energy, if he does spare it, for something more important. If it is from laziness that we have shortened *senior* to *sir* in speaking, it must be from laziness also that we shorten *Mister* to *Mr* in writing, and an Oriental scribe might trace the same degeneracy in our disgracefully easy characters, and in the art of printing altogether. It is not really energy of character which preserves the primitive or traditional sound,

but partly the preciseness which catching a sound distinctly always seeks to preserve it distinct[1], partly what might be called sluggishness of mind hating change, partly the artistic temperament in the poet or declaimer who lingers with delight on all the more musical and expressive sounds, but is equally likely to get rid of harsh and unmelodious consonants. So far as laziness has any effect, its tendency is to produce a drawling pronunciation, giving more importance to the vowels than to the consonants and changing the finer vowels into an indistinct *a* sound.

Perhaps it will be said that, granting that the word *laziness* was ill chosen, still all the observed phonetic changes may be explained on the principle of substituting an easier for a more difficult sound; and that in fact *economy* is admitted as an alternative principle both by Mr Peile and Prof. Max Müller. My answer is that the second principle is hardly noticed by either, and that laziness is no mere phrase, but has its strict moral signification, as is shown by many passages in Mr Peile's book. I will only quote one which seems to me, I confess, to be the *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole theory, when we remember that of all languages the Old Indian has preserved the vowels most faithfully. "The most striking characteristic of the Latin language is the exceeding weakness of its vowel system... The original vowel—the simple sound *a*—passed down every possible step of degradation: and this degradation has been not too fancifully connected with the gradual weakening of the Roman character. The spirit of the Romans grew weak as the breath upon their lips," p. 162. And this is said of the most iron-willed people that ever breathed, while "Græculi" and Indians are supposed to show their strength by the conservatism of their vowel system! I hold, on the contrary, that this contempt for vowel sounds is only one mark of the vigour and energy, and at the same time of the inartistic nature, of the

[1] One is almost ashamed to offer proofs of what must be plain to any man's common sense, but I may be allowed to remind the reader that "a refined and mincing pronunciation" of each separate letter was no more a sign of energy of character among the Romans than among ourselves. See Donaldson's *Varron.* 433, &c.

nation destined *regere imperio populos,* and to leave the arts of peace to others; just as I hold the elaborate vowel system of the Indians to be a mark of the indolent unpractical life of the dreamy Oriental.

Still, is it not true that all known phonetic changes may be described as substitution of an easier for a harder sound? I must own I should be surprised if it were true, assuming that the causes of change were as various as I have endeavoured to show; and in fact, what with *sporadic change,* exceptional cases, and Prof. Max Müller's elastic admission, that "lazy people take the most pains," the operation of the law is so curtailed even by its advocates, that its nominal admission becomes of very little importance. But to one who accepts it blindly it may be the cause of endless confusion. How are you to know what is a harder or easier sound? In one page we find it left to each man to decide from his own experience: p. 2, "It is clear to any one who attempts the sounds, that *a* is a fuller and stronger sound than *i,*" and therefore has a tendency to pass into it. As to this I will venture to say there is not one man in twenty whose consciousness will agree with the scale of difficulty which is laid down by the philologers. To take the letter *a* (by the way it ought to have been stated, to begin with, how the letters should be pronounced), the beginner wishing to test its strength from his own experience will perhaps call to mind such words as *art, it, machine.* He quite agrees as to the *a* of *art* being fuller and stronger than the *i* of *it;* but what of the word *machine?* Is the *urvocal a* to be considered stronger than the *i?* Or his memory may recall the sounds "Unaty in Trinaty," inflicted upon him by some illiterate (or lazy?) reader of the Athanasian Creed. Is he still to hold that the *a* is stronger than the *i* which it has displaced? But then what becomes of the principle that all phonetic change is from stronger to weaker[1]? Compare also

[1] It is really marvellous that one who has ever thought of the subject should be so run away with by a theory as to speak of this *a* in the slang pronunciation, *fellah* for *fellow,* as stronger than the original *ow* (see p. 282). Mr Ferrar puts it on the right ground when he says that "all unaccented vowels in our European languages have a tendency to return to this sound." *Comp. Gr.* p. 6.

the common change from the Latin *i* to the French *a* in such words as *langue*, *balance*, *sanglot*. The fact is that the scale of difficulty differs for each man, and for each nation. One cannot pronounce *r*, another cannot pronounce *l*; most of us have agreed to turn *sayeth* into *says*, but here and there we meet a lisping *theth;* an Englishman is as much exercised over the German *ch* as a German over the English *th*. Some children find *k*, some *f* a great difficulty; an Irishman throws a superfluous breathing into every thing; a Welshman, according to Shakespeare, turns every *media* into the corresponding *tenuis*. Nor does Mr Peile at all disguise this. He points out that the aspirates which were easy to the Greeks were impossible to the Romans, that "though *A* is an older and stronger vowel than *O*, yet in Greek *o*, in consequence perhaps of its broader sound, is constantly used as a stronger modification of *a*." But then if this is granted what meaning remains for the words *stronger* and *weaker?* Do we not fall into a circular argument when we say "this change took place because *o* is stronger than *a*," and again, "we know that *o* is stronger than *a* because this change took place?"

We do find, however, an attempt to base these distinctions of letters upon a more secure foundation than subjective feeling. In p. 8 reference is made to physiological considerations, and we are told that "*k* requires more effort to pronounce than *p*, because the check is applied to the current of air at an earlier point in its course." Again, p. 10, "the check is more complete in pronouncing τ than in pronouncing θ, where the *h* is due to a portion of the breath being allowed to escape before the *t* is fully sounded." (We may observe that this is not quite consistent with p. 55, where we read that "the aspirates are more difficult to pronounce than the momentary checks; they are compound, consisting of the unassisted sound followed by a breath.") So in p. 81, *R* is declared to be stronger than *L*, because it demands a more constrained position of the vocal mechanism, being pronounced further back in the mouth, from which we must infer that *L* is the younger sound. P. 179, "It is surely not difficult to see that the constrained position of the lips in sounding *o* demands more effort than the slight curva-

ture of the tongue which alone is required for sounding *e* or *i*. Therefore, according to our definition, *o* is naturally a stronger sound than *e* or *i*." P. 187, "Corssen concludes that *i*, thin though it be, requires for its pronunciation a considerable tension of the organs of speech differing herein from *e*. This seems very unsatisfactory. It is this effort required in pronunciation and nothing else, which is the mark of a strong vowel, and yet nothing can be plainer than the fact that *i* is weaker than *a*, *o*, or *u*."

So far we have only incidental hints as to the meaning of the terms *strong* and *weak:* it is not until the 217th page that they are fully explained. There it is said that "though every language has its own scale of strength, which is discoverable only by investigating the facts of the particular language, still we can lay down a few broad rules which *seem to be common to all languages,* as they depend on physiological facts. We *may assert with confidence* that a momentary sound is stronger than a protracted one. It is, *I think,* quite clear that the complete check given for a moment to the breath must require a stronger effort on the part of the organs of speech than is needed when there is no perfect stoppage." Hard sounds are stronger than soft. The rationale of this "cannot be shown without entering more into physiological questions than I propose to do." "The aspirate is weaker than the corresponding unaspirated letters...because the breath heard follows a less permanent contact." Hard letters differ in strength according to the length of the air-tube. In the case of vowels it is the whole exertion of both expelling and partially checking the breath which measures the strength. "We have thus got a *tolerably definite* idea of the changes we may expect to find among momentary sounds. For protracted sounds it is less easy to lay down rules. Curtius *thinks* that *m* is stronger than *n*," &c. As the aspirate has been so variously spoken of, we will quote one more passage, p. 299, explaining how unaspirated letters became aspirated in Greek: "The *h* is produced by letting, as it were, a sigh of relief escape after the pronunciation of a difficult sound."

Here then we have at last a real definition of the terms

strength and *weakness*. Yet I think the general tone of it, and especially the words I have italicized, show that Mr Peile is not altogether satisfied with it. It will be noticed also that there does not seem to be entire agreement even as to the physiological basis of the distinction. Corssen's view as to *i* is objected to. In general, I think that the more cautious philologers have had recourse to physiology mainly to explain the process of *assimilation*, and that they have left the difference of vowels in point of *weight* to be determined empirically from the practice of each language.

But passing this by, we will examine the definition on its own merits. Putting it in the most general form it comes to this, that a sound is strong according to the degree of muscular exertion which is required to produce it. This is not I think our general idea of strength. Usually we measure strength by its results. The strongest man is not he who strains his muscles most, but he who with least strain moves the greatest weight. The strongest stroke is not that which costs most effort to the rower, but that which carries the boat farthest through the water. I think therefore that the term is ill-chosen and likely to cause confusion[1]. When the consciousness of the beginner is appealed to as to whether he finds a certain sound strong or weak, he naturally thinks, not of his own effort, but of the volume of sound resulting. And these are not by any means identical; the one is sometimes antagonistic to the other, as may be seen in the case of the vowels. *A*, which is the sound of most volume, and in that sense strongest, is the one which requires least care in pronunciation and therefore, I should say, least muscular effort, nothing beyond the opening of the mouth and expulsion of air

[1] To show how little this technical distinction agrees with our natural feeling of the strength of words, I will take any combination of the "strongest" letters, such as the "hard" gutturals and dentals, and compare them with similar combinations in which the corresponding "soft" letters appear, e.g. *part, bard; cart, guard;* or the German *tod* and English *death* which Hare was fond of contrasting. In this last case we have a technically weaker vowel added to the consonantal weakness, and yet who would doubt that here, as in the other cases, the superiority in strength and fulness of sound lay with the word in which the soft consonant was predominant?

from the lungs. On the other hand, if I may judge from my own consciousness, I should say that among English vowels, *I*, which is the sound of least volume, and in that sense weakest, is the one which requires most care and effort. The tongue is raised so as to oppose a half check and shorten the air-tube and the lips are narrowed (see Max Müller, *Lect.* 2, p. 121). Mr Peile seems to be aware that his definition will scarcely suit his own scale of vowel strength, so he adds to the muscular exertion of the check the initial exertion of expelling the breath. But is there really any ground for supposing that this differs in the case of the different vowels? A strong current of air may be thrown into an *I* just as much as into an *A*, as may be easily seen if after holding the breath for some time we allow it to escape in either form. It might even be maintained that as the passage is narrower in the case of *I* the rush of imprisoned air must be greater. However, we will not contend any longer about the propriety of the term *strength*, but accept thankfully the definition now that we have got it; the strength of a sound varies according to the degree of muscular effort required to pronounce it.

To make this definition of use we must have a scale of muscular exertion, and this is supplied by the doctrine that a complete check requires more effort than a partial check, and that the exertion is greater, the sooner the check is applied, in other words the shorter the air-tube. This sounds reasonable enough, but it is of less use in practice than might have been supposed, from the uncertainty as to the exact point at which the check is applied in pronouncing each letter, and also from the fact that the same letter is pronounced with different degrees of force in different languages or under different circumstances. Thus we read, p. 180, "*l* was a strong sound in Latin," "especially powerful when followed by another consonant;" p. 237, "*s* was sounded strongly when initial, weakly between two vowels." Again, p. 226, "perhaps the Latin *d* was not a true dental, the tongue may only have been pressed against the upper part of the mouth;" and shortly afterwards, "if *r* were sounded at the natural place, the top of the palate, it would be less likely than *l* to be confused with a

dental...but the Italians appear to have had one *r*-sound, which was sounded close behind the upper teeth and so was almost a dental." In other respects also it seems to me that this rule is liable to great exceptions and can only be accepted with a *ceteris paribus* clause. The effort of trilling the *r* or *l* seems to me, consulting my own consciousness, to be much greater than that required for the complete check *p*, which, as Mr Peile allows in p. 220, follows almost involuntarily from the opening or closing of the lips, yet *r* and *l* are among those protracted sounds of which "we may pronounce with confidence, that they are weaker than the momentary," and indeed they are specially mentioned (p. 72) as the easiest of all sounds to pronounce clearly[1]. If further proof is wanted of the comparative difficulty of *p* and *r*, one may be found in the fact that while *p* is nearly the earliest of infantine sounds, Prof. Max Müller himself may be quoted as an instance of a not uncommon incapacity for pronouncing *r* (*Lect.* 2, p. 137). There is one more objection which must surely strike any ordinary person who reads this explanation of the reason of phonetic changes. He is able to recognize some of these varying shades of difficulty and to conceive of others as possibly existing for other people, but can it really have been the case that any half-barbarous primæval race was gifted with such fastidious delicacy of laziness as to appreciate all this infinitesimal gain and loss, and alter their words accordingly? This is the point we have now to consider. Is the theory supported by facts? Can it be shown *à posteriori* that sounds were changed in accordance with the law we have been discussing?

I have not space here to go through the book and point out how much of it is occupied with attempts to show that the law, though apparently broken, is really as good as observed. To one who disbelieves in the law, this special pleading is a constant irritation, a provoking waste of time and ingenuity. Why not be satisfied with prefixing to the discussion of each language a list of the sounds which are historically found to be interchangeable, distinguishing them by some name, such as *original*

[1] If this were so, how did "scenery truly rural" gain its reputation as a test of clear articulation?

and *substituted, older* and *younger*, whatever it might be, which involves no hypothesis as to difficulty of pronunciation? It may be well here to notice some of the exceptional cases alluded to. Their importance may be estimated from the fact that, as Mr Peile tells us in p. 11, Prof. Max Müller proposes to account for them by an entirely distinct principle, which he calls Dialectic Growth. Though Mr Peile refuses to admit this, yet he gives a lecture at the end of his book on Indistinct Articulation of which he says, that "it is possible to alter a language in another way than by merely substituting an easier for a more difficult sound. It is possible to pronounce a word without sufficient sharpness to give each letter its full and proper sound." From this indefinite sound a new sound may arise, "and it is not at all necessary that the new form should be really easier to pronounce than the old one." This is very well, but it is spoilt to my mind by the sentence which follows: "the old saying is here justified that lazy people give themselves most trouble." If laziness acts so blindly as to prefix, and insert, the 'auxiliary' vowels in Greek, and change *ya* into δή and *yug* into ζυγόν (Peile, p. 294 *seq.*); and if, after doing its worst for thousands of years, it leaves a language with such forms as χθών in Greek and 'twelfth' in English, how can we possibly draw any conclusions as to its action? But what a singular view is given of the history of the world, by this supposition of a continuous change for the worse, each nation in its turn lazily dropping the strong sounds of the vigorous primæval race, the less effeminate only proving their superiority by retarding the rate of phonetic corruption for a while, but all alike withheld apparently by some law of destiny from retracing their course; *vestigia nulla retrorsum!* One is curious to know how it was that our forefathers "with no more flexible muscles than ours" (Peile, p. 13), should have selected sounds which have proved such stones of stumbling to their descendants. With regard however to Indistinct Articulation, I venture to assert that it need have no more to do with laziness than the indistinct pronunciation of a nasal by one who has a cold in the head, or the incapacity to perceive a discord on the part of one who has no ear.

Another class of apparent exceptions to the law of degeneracy (whether to that of laziness I cannot say) is found in the 'dynamic intensification' of vowels, of which Mr Peile says "the weakening of original *a* into *a*, *e*, *o* by the Greeks was turned by them into clear gain," p. 6. Another famous example is Grimm's law, of which Grimm himself held that "it showed a certain amount of pride and pluck on the part of the Teutonic nations to have raised the soft to a hard, and the hard to an aspirated letter." Mr Peile, following Prof. Max Müller, endeavours, not very successfully, I think, to reduce it to a case of laziness (p. 218). I need not however seek for further instances. One sentence of Mr Peile's allows all that I am here arguing for; "in every speech amidst the greatest amount of corruption, new forms are still constantly produced by the inexhaustible vital force of language, nay often with vigour proportioned to the amount of loss to be supplied," p. 92. Only I would beg that this principle may be remembered not merely in dealing with the pigeon-hole ticketed *dynamic change*, but also with that ticketed *phonetic change*. As long as a language consists only of monosyllabic roots each syllable may have the same stress laid on it: when the unifying process begins, and the monosyllables crystallize round an accent, what one vowel gains in emphasis another must lose, and the same rule holds in later changes. It is the same human being, acting at the same time, with the same object, whose actions we treat of under these two heads. If we are to credit him with 'inexhaustible vital force' in the one case, we must cease to describe him as all 'laziness' in the other.

It is time now to return to our student whose puzzle as to the use of the terms 'strong' and 'weak' caused all this long digression. In p. 4 he reads that the Greeks changed the final *m* into *n* because they found it an *easier* sound: immediately after it is called *lighter;* in p. 221 Mr Peile says that Curtius holds it to be *weaker*, but he regards it himself to be merely inconvenient at the end of a word. Would it not have been better not to bring in the words *weaker* and *easier* at all, but simply to say that *m* takes more time than *n* to pronounce and would delay the voice on an unimportant syllable?

P. 7. "The hot enervating climate of India weakened the consonants in Sanscrit to a more than usual degree." Yet Sanscrit is "eminently conservative" (p. 5); "the oldest known language of the Indo-Germanic tongue" (p. 18); and yet again "it is an erroneous belief that it is older than its sisters" (p. 23). The same inconsistency of expression is found respecting Latin and Greek. Thus, in p. 20, Greek is said to have "remained closest to the original language;" in p. 26, it is called "undoubtedly the most rich and flexible," while Latin is "the most tenacious and unyielding of the entire family." Yet of Greek we are told that "it is the genius of this language to develope the vowel-system and allow the consonants to decay" (p. 58); and of the tenacious Latin (in that remarkable passage which I have already quoted) that "its vowel-system passed down every step of degradation—a degradation not too fancifully connected with the weakening of the Roman character." And yet again, in p. 129 "the conservative Latin" is complimented on retaining the true weight of vowels which had been lost in Greek; in p. 166 the weakening of the vowels in Latin is said to have "materially increased the force and precision of the written Latin;" while in p. 266, we read "even in consonantal combinations, where the Greek seems to have changed so much more than the Latin, it is in reality more truly conservative." I bring these passages together to show what caution is needed in drawing inferences from particular facts to the general character of a language, and still more in passing beyond the sphere of language to the general character of the people by whom it is spoken.

P. 10. We have here the first use of what I think the very objectionable names, *soft* and *hard* for the *media* and *tenuis*. There is the less excuse for this, as there is a choice of really expressive names such as *sonant* and *surd*, *voiced* and *whispered*, or even the old *flat* and *sharp*. My objection to the words *hard* and *soft* is that the metaphor intended is not appropriate: the difference of sound observable between *p* and *b* is not like the difference produced by striking a hard and a soft object, but rather like that produced by striking wood and metal. In the next place, *hard* is liable to be confounded with difficult,

and *soft* with low-voiced, so that the latter would really suit the *whispered*, better than the *voiced* letter.

P. 12. I think the experience of most people would go with Prof. Max Müller in denying that 'glory' and 'cloth' are often pronounced 'dlory' and 'tloth.' No doubt a careless hearer may easily mistake one sound for the other, but they are perfectly distinct to the speaker; and since *dl* and *tl* are so far from being natural English sounds, that we have no words beginning with either, while *gl* and *cl* are among our commonest combinations, I see no reason why any one should prefer the false pronunciation, and certainly I am not aware that I have ever heard it. Though I cannot agree with Mr Craik in deriving 'clever' from 'deliver,' yet the change from *dl* to *cl* is more intelligible than the converse. The feeling of the Latin language seems to have been the same as our own in this respect: *gl* and *cl* are of frequent occurrence, while *dl* and *tl* are unknown or extremely rare; in fact the forms *latus* and *lis* show how intolerable the sound *tl* was felt to be. One more proof which may be alleged in favour of *gl* is that it is a sound, as I am informed by experienced persons, greatly affected by infants even before they arrive at distinct articulation of single consonants.

P. 19. What ground is there for the statement that Latin is more like Keltic than like Greek?

P. 23. Is the principle of *euphony*, which is mentioned here and in several other passages, to be considered distinct from the principle of *laziness*?

P. 25. Is not the 'rigorous observance of phonetic laws' carried too far in the severance of *θεός* from *Deus*? These laws seem to me to be merely the statement of a general tendency resulting from many different causes, which, being to some extent under the control of man's free will, need not necessarily act with the regularity of purely physical causes. Every language has its anomalies, and with regard to the particular case of $d = \theta$, the difficulty seems a little exaggerated, as we regularly find this correspondence in the middle of a word. Curtius gives *αἴθω aedes*, *ἄνθος*, *adoreus*, &c. Nay, even Mr Peile, though here he denies the possibility of an initial *d* in Latin corresponding to

a Greek *θ*, yet in p. 42 tells us "no one doubts that *ab-do, con-do,* &c. are formed from the root DHA, Gr. *θε*."

P. 27. Is the evidence for 'vast prehistoric time' derived from language really conclusive? Prof. Max Müller gives examples proving the extraordinary rapidity of linguistic change among uncivilized races; and in simple patriarchal times, it seems to me, that any physical inability or trick on the part of the chief was likely to be caught up by the clan and become hereditary. One of the reasons given for believing in a vast prehistoric period, is the 'flexibility and lightness' of the Indo-European roots in the earliest stage known to us: but why need the primæval language have been heavy and inflexible?

P. 31. Among many things told of the original Indo-European race which are calculated to try the faith of the student, perhaps their liking for the sounds BH, DH, GH, is the most remarkable. It is some little consolation to find that the philologers who discovered these uncouth combinations are themselves puzzled how to pronounce them. On the whole, it seems from pp. 55, 262 that we may hope that the H was not really an *h* after all, *i.e.* not the *spiritus asper,* but only a 'breath.'

P. 33. It seems impossible to explain the scale of *a* here given, unless we take the first *a* to be merely the *ur-vocal,* that which is "least modified by the organs of speech," which least requires muscular effort, and is therefore (physiologically) the weakest of the vowels.

P. 34. The word *qualitative* should have been explained; and *vocalism* in the next page. In the latter page, Schleicher's words are quoted with approval: "the vowels can express relation as well as meaning, the consonants are nothing but elements in the expression of meaning." I am not sure that I understand this, but it would seem to deny that the *s* of *dominus* expresses the relation of the *subject,* and the *n* of *tango* the relation of the *present.*

P. 37. It seems to me that one of the weak points in the book is the very inadequate list of examples of substitution. Considering how slight is the attention given to etymology in the ordinary Latin Dictionaries, full lists of classified deriva-

tions would have been of great service to students. Why is *q* omitted among the Latin equivalents of K? What is meant by calling KI the antithet of AK? It should mean *bluntness* in that case, not *quietness*. And would it not have been worth while to compare the root of κινέω?

P. 38. 'Κεῖμαι not a perfect, in form, any more than in sense.' Rather say 'in form analogous to ἀφεῖμαι, in sense the perfect of τίθημι,' even though κοίτη should induce us to agree in calling it a Present.

P. 40. Why is not Latin *tono* given under root TA?

P. 44. Should not *b* be given as a Latin equivalent to π, as we have *ab, ob, sub*[1], *bibo*, &c.?

"The root ΠΑ, to *protect*, gave the Europeans the word *patar*, a father."

The converse is much more probable: nature's word for *father* suggested the more general word for *protection*, and such seem to be Mr Peile's second thoughts. See p. 66, 96.

P. 45. It would have been more convenient to have separated general discussions, such as this on the theory of secondary roots, from the account of particular words. Is it worth while recording Pott's wonderful derivation for πίθος?

P. 63. What does Mr Peile mean by speaking of the use of ἔρπω in the general sense of "go" as *peculiar* to the Dorians?

P. 65. The remarks made upon the diversity of names for the sun &c. among the early races, are hardly such as we should expect from a believer in Comparative Mythology (p. 51). If the whole mythology of the Aryan races may be traced back to mistaken meteorological metaphors, there surely must have been an original community of names, as well as a pitiable, in fact a (to me) incredible, "dependence on atmospheric conditions."

P. 67. It is odd that *nasals* should have been unable to stand alone in the original language, as the nasal *ma* comes so naturally to infants now.

[1] I am not sure whether Mr Peile would connect this with ὑπό, as on two occasions (pp. 231, 302) he mentions it as an example of incorrect aspiration. He should at any rate have accounted for the *s* in *sub* and *super*.

P. 71. The reign of fancy has certainly not yet come to an end in etymology, if we are to accept the statement that *maneo* is derived from a root meaning *thought*, because a man may be "so filled with thought that he stands stock-still."

P. 75. Mr Peile seems greatly to admire Corssen's account of *exta* and *juxta*, as he repeats it again in p. 197. Without further explanation it will be utterly unintelligible to the beginner. He may possibly guess that the ingenious *ec-ista* means 'most outwards,' but what has that to do with the only *exta* of which he has ever heard, the dictionary meaning of which is 'the inward parts?' What is meant by *denominative* in the same page? The only explanation yet given is in p. 41, which will not apply either here or in p. 114.

P. 82. I do not understand the reason given for transposition of a vowel with *r*. It seems to me that if in a word like *θάρσος* the *r* is rolled, the preceding vowel is necessarily slurred and a faint vowel sound audible after the *r*.

P. 180. Speaking of vowel change produced by assimilation from neighbouring consonants, it is said that *o* is changed into *u* in the word *bubus* through the influence of the following *b*. Is it not rather the vocalizing of *v*, *bovibus* passing into *bubus* like *denovo* into *denuo?* I hardly understand how it can be said that "there is a great gulf fixed between these vowels" (p. 177), when, from the time of the Scipios to that of Quintilian, there seem to have been many words which might be spelt with *o* or *u* indifferently (p. 165), and when in fact we often find an archaic *u* changed into *o* in the Augustan spelling (p. 182).

P. 165. I am a little suspicious of Latin orthography intruding itself into English, and regret to see the form *genetive* admitted in the later pages of the book. Surely *genitive* has been naturalized long enough to be independent of whatever spelling criticism may assign to *genetivus*.

P. 135. Is it necessary to suppose that the *-ες* of *σαφές* is weakened from *-ος*? Why may it not have come directly from *ας*; as we read, p. 131, that the change from *a* to *e* was prior in time, and spread more widely than that from *a* to *o*? The nominative of the neuter substantive (*γένος*) appears exceptional,

not only when we compare it with its cognate adjective but even with its own inflexions.

P. 202. 'Agnitus' is quoted as an example of the power of accent to shorten a long unaccented syllable; but if the original form were 'agnōtus,' as implied, then by the ordinary law of accentuation the accent must have been on the penultimate and preserved it from being shortened. Indeed 'cognitus' is mentioned in the next page as a proof of Corssen's law, contravening the old law.

P. 104. The term *continuous* is surely more appropriate for "I am doing" than either *protracted* or *permanent*.

The discussion which follows is not by any means clear; but it would take too much time to unravel it, and I have perhaps given sufficient specimens of the kind of difficulties which are to be met with in the book, and which are, I think, likely to interfere with its usefulness as a handbook. Perhaps it would have been better if the lecture-form had been given up. A lecturer is apt to be loose and unsystematic, to run into digressions, and to have recourse sometimes to devices for keeping alive the attention of the class, which are hardly deserving of being immortalized in print. For all these reasons I should hope that in a new edition the volume may be recast, and appear in a simpler and at the same time a more scientific form.

I may add that I have noticed the following misprints: xix. l. 3, for *Latin* read *Later*; l. 5 from bottom, for *number* read *member*; p. 2, accents omitted; 52, marg. for *specialization* read *generalization*; 81, l. 1, for *s* read *v*; 109, for *strengthenod* read *strengthened*; 131, l. 4 from bottom, for *are* read *is*; 148, l. 5 from bottom, for φασί read φαισί; 304, l. 14, for *when* read *what*.

J. B. MAYOR.

'DECADENCE.'

I AM afraid it is no longer possible to extinguish this barbarous Gallicism which has been accepted now by so many of our best writers; still I think it would not be unfitting that

Cambridge, which raised its protest against 'telegram,' should at any rate express its disapproval of the far less excusable 'decadence.' 'Telegram' could plead in its favour the undoubted need for a new word, and its own superiority in point of simplicity and convenience over any of its rivals, as well as the fact that it seemed to be supported by English analogy, and could only be proved incorrect by a reference to the laws of Greek composition. 'Decadence,' on the contrary, obtrudes itself into ground already occupied by 'decay,' 'decline' and other words; it is entirely opposed to analogy, no less in English than in the original Latin—compare such forms as 'accidence,' 'incidence,' 'coincidence,' 'occident,' 'deciduous'—and, to heighten its barbarity, it makes its entrée into English with an accented penultimate, that is, if we may assume that Drummond's line quoted in Latham's Johnson,

'doth in decádence fall and slack remain,'

is the first example of its use. Dr Latham supposes it to be an original English compound, but I think there can be little doubt that it was borrowed from the French, which was itself derived from the Low Latin 'decadentia' like 'decadivus.' The earliest examples of its use given in Littré are from Calvin and Montaigne; but the title of Montesquieu's famous work was probably the means of making it generally known. Thus we find Goldsmith recurring to 'decadence,' though Sir Thomas Browne in the previous century had made use of the correctly formed 'decidence.' Gibbon, notwithstanding his French tastes, sticks to the English word 'decline;' and 'decadence' seems to have made little way in England until the last quarter of a century, when, possibly owing to the influence of Comte, it came into fashion, apparently to *denote* decline, and *connote* a scientific and enlightened view of that decline on the part of the user. One cannot ask enlightenment to forget itself; but might it not learn to etymologize correctly, and, retaining the same connotation, to use the form *decidence* instead of *decadence?*

J. B. MAYOR.

HORACE, CARM. I 20.

Vile potabis modicis Sabinum
cantharis, Graeca quod ego ipse testa
conditum levi, datus in theatro
cum tibi plausus,
care Maecenas eques, ut paterni
fluminis ripae simul et iocosa
redderet laudes tibi Vaticani
montis imago.
Caecubum et prelo domitam Caleno
tu bibes uvam; mea nec Falernae
temperant vites neque Formiani
pocula colles.

Horace invites Maecenas to come and see him: 'you shall drink' he tells him 'cheap Sabine wine, bottled by me when you received in the theatre such tumultuous applause'. Then without the least connecting link he goes on to say: 'Caecuban and Calenian *you shall drink:* I possess neither Falernian nor Formian'.

What is the meaning and connexion here? you shall drink cheap Sabine: *you* shall quaff the most costly Latin and Campanian wines; such wines do not fill *my* cups. *Bibes* must be synonymous with *potabis,* as the words themselves declare, as well as the 'Vina *bibes* interum Tauro diffusa cet.' of epist. 1, 7, 5, the invitation to Torquatus in that epistle resembling

in many points that given in our ode. And what force is there in the evidently designed antithesis of *tu* and *mea?*

The older editors, even Lambinus and Bentley, did not feel, at all events they take no notice of the difficulty. Not so recent editors. Peerlkamp in his usual fashion pronounces the ode spurious. In the Rhenish Museum for 1837, p. 598, Lud. Doederlein perceives the absurdity of *Tu bibes,* and proposes *Tum bibes.* This has been adopted by those editors who are most distinguished for their accurate knowledge of the language and will not tolerate any solecism of *expression*, by Meineke, Haupt, Luc. Mueller among others; even by Keller in his elaborate critical edition. But if this change sets right the expression, it appears to me I confess to sacrifice the thought and poetical truth. If the words have now any force, they must imply that Horace will next give him a better wine than Sabine, but has not the best of all in his cellar. Yet surely no one who knows Horace will assert that the poet held any wines to be more costly than Calenian and Caecuban: 'Premant Calena falce quibus dedit Fortuna vitem': 'Absumet heres Caecuba dignior Servata centum clavibus, et mero Tinguet pavimentum superbo Pontificum potiore cenis'. Caecuban in fact, from its excellence and the smallness of the space on which it was grown, was the most expensive of Italian wines: Pliny (XIV § 61) tells us that in his time it had been destroyed 'incuria coloni locique angustia', but chiefly by Nero's canal from Ostia to Baiae; that however 'antea Caecubo erat generositas celeberrima', while '*secunda* nobilitas Falerno agro erat'.

It seems to me clear that Horace, wishing to say Maecenas can afford costly wines, but he himself cannot, singles out in his usual manner Calenian, one of the finest of Campanian, and Caecuban, the most precious of Latin wines, to match with Falernian, the most famous of Campanian, and Formian, the next best of Latin wines; and that it would have answered his purpose just as well, if he had said 'you can afford Falernian and Formian, I cannot afford Calenian or Caecuban'. And this is felt by those whom we might call the common sense editors, who wish to give a consistent meaning to Horace's words; but, with far less knowledge of the

language than is possessed by the supporters of 'tum', fear to change the words of the manuscripts, but often do not fear to give these words a meaning which they cannot bear. Among these editors are Mitscherlich, Orelli, Dillenburger, Ritter and Macleane. The latter, following in the wake of the others, thus construes: 'you may drink, if you please, the richer wines': and for this impossible sense of *bibes* refers with the rest to other futures which have no analogy whatever to this.

The passage can hardly be right as it stands; and as *tu* and *mea* are in almost necessary contrast, the corruption would seem to lie in *bibes*. The mutual relation of Horace's Mss. cannot be determined, and with slight exceptions they appear all to have *bibes;* but on referring to Keller I see that one of the oldest Parisian Mss., which he designates by λ, gives *bides*. Assuming this to be an earlier form of the corruption, it is natural that with such a context ignorant scribes should change it to *bibes*. But *bides* would most nearly represent not *bibes*, but *vides*, as for centuries before these Mss. were written *b* and *v* in many words were used almost indifferently: thus, to give one instance out of a thousand, in Lucr. III 902 both the Vossian Mss. have *bideant* for *videant*.

Tu vides then I believe to be the true reading, with the sense of 'you provide', 'supply', 'can afford'. Dictionaries shew that the word not unfrequently has this or similar meanings of the compound *provideo:* Ter. heautont. 457 'Nam ut alia omittam, pytissando modo mihi Quid vini absumpsit 'sic hoc' dicens, 'asperum, Pater, hoc est: aliut lenius sodes *vide': Relevi* dolia omnia, omnes serias'. Horace was familiar with Terence, and I think it not improbable that this *vide* and the very rare use of *relevi* suggested to him, perhaps unconsciously, his own *vides* and *levi*. Cic. ad Att. v 1, 3 'id autem ex eo, ut opinor, quod antecesserat Statius, ut prandium nobis videret'; Tusc. disp. III 46 'eripiamus huic aegritudinem. quo modo? conlocemus in culcita plumea,... dulciculae potionis aliquid videamus et vini'. The following passages too will illustrate this usage: Ter. heautont. 670 'Nisi aliquid video, ne...resciscat senex'; Cic. de orat. III 2 'videndum sibi esse

aliud consilium: illo senatu se rempublicam gerere non posse'; ad fam. VII 20, 2 'sed valebis meaque negotia videbis'; Livy XXI 4, 10 'nulla re, quae agenda videndaque magno futuro duci esset, praetermissa'; Ovid ars I 587 'Inde procurator nimium quoque multa procurat Et sibi mandatis plura videnda putat'. That Horace knew the Caecuban stowed away in Maecenas' palace, would appear from epod. IX: Quando repostum Caecubum ad festas dapes, Victore laetus Caesare, Tecum sub alta (sic Iovi gratum) domo, Beate Maecenas, bibam.

Peerlkamp, contending that the ode is spurious, has a long note upon the second stanza. He says, what is perfectly true, that Virgil has *vocis imago*, Silius *clamoris imago*, and so on. And then he adds 'sed nemo unquam eccho appellavit *imaginem montis, silvae* vel *saxi;* neque dicere potuit'. But has not the writer of this ode been able to say 'montis imago'? or is he a second Οὔτις? or, if he is *nonnemo* and therefore could not say '*montis imago*', then this must be due to some Nobody of a copyist. How does it help to prove then that Horace did not write the rest of the ode? But in the first place, not only Horace himself (I 12, 4), but Cicero, Varro and others use *imago* absolutely for an echo: and in the next place the following parallel appears to me to justify and more than justify *montis imago*. Virgil, geor. IV 50, says 'vocisque offensa resultat imago'; but that does not prevent him from saying in Aen. V 150 'pulsati colles clamore resultant'; VIII 305 'Consonat omne nemus strepitu collesque resultant'. And he has been followed by the writers of the silver age, prose and verse, downwards to Ammian (XXXI 13, 2) in this use of *resulto*. Now surely 'colles resultant', 'caelum resultat' and the like are at least as strange as 'montis imago'.

H. A. J. MUNRO.

Carm. 2. 13, 14. *Pœnus perhorrescit.*

That a corruption lies in the word *Pœnus* Mr Munro has shown conclusively: that Lachmann's substitution of *Thynus* ought to be accepted is not so clear.

The poet's axiom here has three instances; *navita...miles ...Parthus:* is it not worth observing that of these three, set in antithesis to one another, only the first has an epithet? This Ode is among the most polished and exact in its language, and the introduction of a descriptive geographical adjective breaks the balance of the clauses.

Nor can it be denied that as an epithet it is out of place. A word standing where *Pœnus* does in this sentence is weak unless it attaches itself immediately to the preceding or following word. Thus if any one proposed to read *Bosporum flumen* with the geographical term taken adjectively (the phrase is conceivable by comparison with others, or as a partial imitation of Æschylus, Persæ, 746) there would be a full and sufficient weight on the substantive, and no sense of break, pause or dislocation of words. Or again, if a word can be found which with equal force attaches to the verb following, the versification will equally satisfy the ear. Such a word must then express the feeling or action of sailors in extreme danger. What does Horace ascribe to such in such a time? (see Carm. 3. 22. 58) *ad miseras preces decurrere.* Sophocles again describes a voyager in excess of fear as crouching and prostrate, *ὑφ' εἵματος κρυφεὶς πατεῖν παρεῖχε τῷ θέλοντι*, Ajax, 1145. Either of these senses might be represented by *pronus.* The adjective would be no mere epithet but would fall into the adverbial usage so frequent in *plurimus* and *improbus.*

It may be said that *pronus* is not, any more than *πρηνής*, ordinarily used of suppliants. This is partly because the *χαμαιπετὲς βόαμα* was more accordant with the Oriental than the Western character. But I find in the prayer of Deucalion and Pyrrha (Ov. Met. 1. 375) *procumbit uterque pronus humi.*

And there is nothing in the primary meaning of the word to prevent its being so applied.

On these grounds I suggest as a corrected text,

Navita Bosporum
Pronus perhorrescit.

The mariner in prostrate suppliant dread shudders at the Bosporus.

Sat. 1. 3. 25. *Cum tua pervideas oculis mala lippus inunctis.*

This line is unquestionably an imitation of the Greek fragment cited by Bentley, *τί τἀλλότριον...κακὸν ὀξυδορκεῖς τὸ δ' ἴδιον παραβλέπεις.*

But *pervideas* does not mean, as *παραβλέπεις*, 'you overlook;' but 'you look into thoroughly, keenly.' (This difficulty has commonly been got over by interpreting *pervideas lippus* after the analogy of *cæcior spectas* in Sat. 1. 2. 91; but to this there is the forcible objection, especially in a writer so exact as Horace, that *pervideas* must in that case be simply = *videas*, and the emphasis of *per* be lost.)

Now *per*, *præ* and *pro* are perpetually liable to be confounded and substituted for each other in MSS. and editions; see for instance Cic. Off. 3. 75, *perviderit*, where Manutius notes that five MSS. have *præv.* and eight *prov.;* or compare the conflicting *præsectum* and *perfectum* in Ars Poet. 294. It would be easy to add to these instances. But it is needless. No one would object to reading *prævideas* with Bentley on the ground of its being a violent alteration, and there is some MS. authority for it. Bentley proposed it on the supposition *ut prævideas idem sit ac prætervideas.* Is there any reason against this, except the somewhat curious fact that *prætervidere* is nowhere found—a vox nihili? There seems to be some mistake as to the meaning of these prepositions, *præ* and *præter*. *Præfluo* e.g. is said to be for *præterfluo; præcurro* for *prætercurro*. Why? Really they are two modes of expression containing the same result. The river, *qui regna Dauni præ-*

fluit Apuli, 'flows along the border of,' also *prœterfluit* 'flows past those *regna;*' but the one word is not identical with and is not therefore properly said to be a substitute for the other.

Why should *prævideo* 'I look along the edge of (or) in front of' not be used in the sense of 'overlooking'? It expresses a glimpse, a hasty superficial view. The objection made to this is that we find as a fact that the word is in usage restrained to the idea of 'seeing first or beforehand:' in other words, to the idea of time not space. But if *præ* equally applies in other words to space as to time, Horace was at liberty so to use it, and he is remarked for preferring the natural and primary sense of words to the conventional.

Prævideas, then, if it may bear the sense of 'overlooking,' expresses the Greek original, and answers to its context. And the fact that there is no word of rival meaning leads up to two inferences, (1) that it was a word rarely wanted and therefore the examples would be few, (2) that there could be no objection to the word being diverted, as occasion served, to this meaning when no synonym was in use. It is finally now to be asked whether there is actually no instance extant of *prævidere* bearing this sense. I contend that there is. Tacitus, Ann. 12. 63, tells us Chalcedon was termed the Country of the Blind because its founders in choosing the site for their city had overlooked the superior advantage of the Byzantine side, *quod priores illuc advecti prævisa locorum utilitate pejora legissent.* To construe *prævisa* as = *ante visa* involves the absurdity of saying that they wilfully instead of blindly relinquished the advantages open to them. On the other hand the meaning 'overlooked' exactly fits the sentence.

I contend that these passages of Tacitus and Horace mutually throw light on each other, and that *prævideas* is to be accepted as the reading of the Satire.

In connection with the foregoing argument I put down some of the words in which Horace marks his independence of ordinary usage, and his preferential adoption of accurate and primary meanings: insolens, insolentia, ambitiosus (C. 1. 36, ult. Cf. A. P. 447); revictus, redono, retracto, reddo (C. 1. 3. 7. Cf. Virg. Æn. 6. 18); infans (S. 1. 6. 57); increpo (Ep. 17. 28);

evenio (C. 4. 4. 65); examen (C. 1. 35. 31); and with these may be classed his numerous ἅπαξ λεγόμενα prodoceo, juvenor, æterno, claro, inimico, intaminatus.

I have noted at various times usages in Tacitus which seem to indicate in his style a remembrance and adoption of Horatian language; and if it is allowed that he had any frequent regard to it, weight should be allowed to this in the argument for *prœvideas.*

Compare *dabat et famœ,* Tac. Ann. 1. 7, with Hor. S. S. 2. 2. 94, *contusis,* Ann. 4. 46, with C. 3. 6. 10; *muto,* Ann. 12. 13. Sat. 1. 4. 29. 2. 7. 110; *villarum molibus,* Ann. 4. 67. C. 3. 29. 10. *additus,* Ann. ib. C. 3. 4. 78.

additis veteranis, Ann. 13. 31, is relied on by Orelli as confirming the reading *addidit,* C. 3. 4. 38.

falsum renidens, Ann. 4. 60, seems like a prose adaptation from *perfidum ridens* of C. 3. 27. 67; *breve confinium,* Ann. 4, 59 from *exiguo fine,* C. 2. 1, 19.

The Germania, 18. 19, contains general and verbal resemblances to Carm. 3. 24.

J. E. YONGE.

ON TWO TRIPLE READINGS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In 2 Pet. iii. 10 the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS, supported by some ancient versions, preserve the reading *καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται*. For *εὑρεθήσεται* we find in C *ἀφανισθήσονται*[1], in A the common reading *κατακαήσεται*. Can we find any explanation which shall account for the strange fact that the best attested reading is contrary to the sense, and for the double variation from it?

A rough and ready remedy suggests itself at once. We may suppose that *οὐχ* before *εὑρεθήσεται* was accidentally omitted either in the original or in a copy from which all our MSS have descended: and that the readings of A and C are corrections to make sense. But surely copyists would be more likely to restore the negative than to substitute quite different words. For the reading of C especially we must not admit such an explanation without searching for one less improbable.

Another suggestion is that *εὑρεθήσεται* has somehow got into the text from the Latin *urentur*. But it is waste of critical power to apply to a triple variation a hypothesis which only explains two readings: and this suggestion leaves *ἀφανισθήσονται* unaccounted for. Besides, would *κατακαήσεται* have been translated by[2] *urentur*?

[1] Wetstein and Tischendorf quote Syr. for *ἀφανισθήσονται*: but I do not know what can have been Wetstein's authority for this: my friends who are learned in Syriac can find no such reading. As usual I have failed to detect any inaccuracy in the readings given by Tregelles.

[2] Having looked at the passages where *κατακαίειν* has to be translated in nearly all the old Latin versions I find that *cremare* is employed in *e* of

There is however a third solution of the problem which seems to me to remove nearly all difficulty. It is to suppose that the original word πυρωθήσεται gradually became less and less legible: so that the first scribe who undertook to copy the epistle found only .ΥΡ.ΘΗCΕΤΑΙ—the first and fourth letters having perisht—and wrote down a verb which occurred to him as containing all the letters he could see. A second copyist was too late to see ΥΡ but in time to see Θ; so he wrote ἀφανισθήσεται (or -σονται)[3]. A third when only the termination remained visible strayed a little further from the original word but returned exactly to the sense with κατακαήσεται.

Very similar is the triple variation in Heb. xi. 13; where Tregelles reads κομισάμενοι with ℵ P 17, 39: A has προσδεξάμενοι: the common reading is λαβόντες. Everyone must I think feel that here κομισάμενοι is the right word. The sower going forth may be said προσδέχεσθαι or (ver. 17) ἀναδέχεσθαι the promise of the harvest: but it is not till he brings his sheaves home that he κομίζεται τὰς ἐπαγγελίας. We may here say almost with certainty that one copyist coming first or seeing clearest preserved κομισάμενοι; another (whence A) saw the end of the word but made a bad guess at the beginning; others gave up finding out the letters—perhaps by this time their remains were past searching for—and supplied the sensible but commonplace λαβόντες.

These instances of gradual obliteration occur just where we should expect to meet with them, in epistles which for a long time were not generally known, and therefore very possibly not transcribed. And in the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews there seems to be a further reason for assuming that its existence depended for many years on a single copy. For the absence of any clear tradition as to its author cannot to my mind be in any way accounted for except by supposing that

Mat. xiii. 30 and *d f* of Heb. xiii. 11; *exurere* in *e* of Mat. xiii. 40; *ardere* in *d f* of 1 Cor. iii. 15; with these exceptions always *comburere*.

[3] It must be noticed that the *plural* ἀφανισθήσονται is a slight objection to my hypothesis: but I think a very slight one. For there is but little difference between CΕΤΑΙ and CΟΝΤΑΙ: or—perhaps more probably—the change to the plural may have been the result of a later transcription.

it was never, or at least not for many years, delivered to the church for whom it was written. A little consideration will shew that this is not a very extravagant hypothesis. The date of the epistle is generally allowed to be somewhere before the destruction of Jerusalem. Place it just about the beginning of the Jewish war: and imagine the bearer of it in the course of his journey to bethink himself or be warned by friends that such a letter, exhorting Hebrews to endurance by the example of their heroic ancestors who so often by faith "bent back the alien array," must if detected be a certain warrant of death: would not his only prudent course—both for his own safety and for that of the letter—be to leave it in some safe hiding-place in the care of the next Christian brother with whom he lodged, there to remain we know not how long, perhaps almost till the time when it was read by Clement and frequently alluded to in his epistle to the Corinthians?

As the circumstances of these epistles seem to have been such as to render probable these various readings, at least if I have rightly explained how they arose; so in turn they help to establish the early date of the epistles. For the phenomena of various readings require time for their development just like the phenomena of deposition and denudation in geology.

A. A. VANSITTART.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A., AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.